



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2014

No. 57

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 8, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB WOODALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

ALLOW A VOTE ON IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, this is my weekly reminder to House Republicans that they have only 30 legislative days before the July 4 recess. In that time they had better allow a vote for immigration reform or the President will take executive action to reform our immigration.

The chance to save the Republican Party from being a regional party and not a national one rests on what Re-

publican leaders do during the next 30 legislative days. If they deny justice, security, and dignity to our brothers and sisters with foreign hands, who work every day in American fields to plant and pick our vegetables, the Republican Party is giving up on the chance for their brothers and sisters with Republican hands to pick and plant vegetables in the White House's vegetable garden any time soon.

Tomorrow, Wednesday, the Hispanic Congressional Caucus will have a special meeting with Secretary of Homeland Security Johnson. We will present him with a memo that lays out options the Obama administration has under current law to protect more immigrants from a deportation along the lines of deferred action for DREAMers.

The important phrase here is "under current law." In February 2011, we delivered a memo to the President outlining specific actions he could take within existing law to keep families together, spare military families, and, yes, spare those who would qualify for the DREAM Act; protecting them temporarily on a case-by-case basis from deportation using tools in the law like deferred action, parole, and hardship waivers.

Our position was strengthened in April of that year by a paper called "Executive Branch Authority Regarding Implementation of Immigration Law and Policies." The report was written by Bo Cooper, who served as general counsel at the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and by Paul Virtue, who was also general counsel at the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The report said:

The executive branch, through the Secretary of Homeland Security, can exercise discretion not to prosecute a case by granting "deferred action" to an otherwise removable or deportable immigrant.

Only a month before deferred action for DREAMers was announced, a letter

signed with footnotes and citations was sent to the President from almost 100 law professors at our top law schools and universities outlining the power the President has to spare immigrants from deportation.

Legal scholars and research are not always enough to persuade my friends in the Republican Conference. Almost every single one of them voted for the King amendment defunding deferred action last year and voted this year to sue the President over immigration enforcement. They are rejecting these arguments as some kind of academic hoax.

So, as I have done in the past, I ask you not to just take my word for it, or the word of legal experts, or hundreds of law professors. I ask you to take the word of your former Judiciary chairman—three of them—when it comes to immigration and deportation.

Here is the letter from November 1999 where at least 28 Republicans and Democrats called on President Clinton to exercise prosecutorial discretion when it comes to deportation and immigration enforcement. It is in this letter:

There has been widespread agreement that some deportations were unfair and resulted in unjustifiable hardship.

The principle of prosecutorial discretion is well established.

It is in the letter:

Optimally, removal proceedings should be initiated or terminated only upon specific instruction from authorized INS officials, issued in occurrence with agency guidelines.

They go on to urge that those guidelines—it is in there—they urge those guidelines should be issued from headquarters, just as the Hispanic Congressional Caucus is going to urge the President to issue guidelines for initiation and termination of deportation proceedings tomorrow.

Let's see, here is LAMAR SMITH, and JAMES SENSENBRENNER signed it, and Henry Hyde. Three Republican chairmen of the Judiciary Committee signed

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2993

this letter, stating that the President had broad discretion. Mr. Speaker, three former chairmen of the House Judiciary Committee, the legal foundation upon which this opinion rests, is as rock solid as their conservative credentials are.

Yet, to this day, the Republican Conference has not come up with an immigration bill or a series of bills of their own. The American people are still waiting for Republicans to write their own immigration bills or amend the ones that were sent to us by a two-thirds bipartisan majority in the Senate.

I am here to remind my friends in the Republican Conference that the time is running out. If you don't take action, the President will take action to permit millions upon millions of undocumented immigrants to be able to live safely in the United States of America. It is your choice.

GABRIELLA MILLER RESEARCH ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Washington can get things done. It may not be all the time, but over the last year we have been able to make constructive progress on an array of issues. Had it not been for Members on all sides of the aisle coming together, looking past party labels, and working on what is important, this would not have been the case.

Last week on Thursday, April 3, President Obama signed into law an important piece of legislation that represents one of those points of progress.

In December of last year, the House passed bipartisan legislation to shift \$126 million—money previously used to finance national political conventions—to the National Institutes of Health, where it will now support research into childhood cancer and other pediatric diseases, including Down syndrome, cancer, autism, and the countless other diseases that affect our children that don't yet have a cure.

In March of 2014 the Senate passed the legislation, again with bipartisan support. That bill—now law—was the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act. There have been many critical research breakthroughs over the past decade. As a result of this new law, millions of additional dollars will be put towards research in an effort to develop treatments and cures for pediatric disorders and diseases. Today, more are on the horizon, and with passage of this law, they will be upon us that much more quickly.

As most are aware, Gabriella Miller passed away from cancer, an inoperable brain tumor, in October of 2013. Gabriella, before her passing, stated: "If I go, if I lose my battle, then I'm going to want other people to carry on with the war. They are going to win this war."

Mr. Speaker, although there is much more to be done, with the passage of this act, this body took one small step in that direction. Through this new law we honor the legacy of a brave and spirited young girl who left a mark on the Nation and the world. Let us continue to fight this battle on behalf of so many boys and girls in similar positions. My prayers are with Gabriella and her family.

TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, April 16 marks Emancipation Day in the District of Columbia, when the slaves who lived in the District of Columbia were emancipated.

I come to the floor this week to discuss a different kind of emancipation. Today, I begin, as the Nation began, with taxes without representation. If I were to ask you who pays the highest taxes per capita in the United States of America, who would you say? What jurisdiction would you say? New York? Connecticut? Arizona? Texas?

It would be the citizens of the Nation's Capital who support the Nation without representation in the Congress of the United States, the 650,000 citizens of the Nation's Capital. That is why you see D.C. license plates that say, "Taxation Without Representation." That was not the idea of the D.C. government. It was a citizen who came forward to suggest that this should be what was on our license plates.

So, April 16—we in the District commemorate Emancipation Day every year because we have the distinction of being the first jurisdiction in the United States where the slaves were emancipated 9 months before they were emancipated elsewhere. The irony is, we are now the last jurisdiction where citizens of every background do not enjoy equal rights. All other Americans have at least one voting Representative and two Senators. District of Columbia citizens have no vote on this House floor and no Senators.

All other Americans govern themselves without interference from the Congress. The District of Columbia must abide the nullification of local laws if the Congress sees fit. All other Americans enjoy total control of their own taxpayer funds. The District budget, approved by and raised by District officials, must be approved in this House and in the Senate by people who had nothing to do with raising those funds.

All other Americans pass any constitutional local law they see fit. All local laws of the District of Columbia must lay over here in the House to see whether somebody wants to pop up and overturn them, even if they are constitutional.

What is the difference between the people I represent and the people my

colleagues represent? We do not have statehood rights, and that is what any citizen who pays taxes and serves in the armed services for the Nation deserves. We seek statehood, the only way to achieve what we have sought and still seek: budget autonomy, legislative autonomy, freedom from interference into our lives by the Congress of the United States.

The Nation's first principle, the principle that gave rise to revolution, is taxation without representation. How would you feel if the highest per capita taxes were paid by your citizens and they didn't have the same rights as every other citizen?

District residents pay almost \$12,000 per capita; the lowest are paid, and I point them out only because they are the lowest, by Mississippi, and their taxes are the lowest. I don't go through all the States because there is not room. But what is your State? New York? \$8,737 per person. Compare that to our almost \$12,000 per D.C. resident, and New York is a large State. California ranks 10th, \$8,162 per capita compared to our \$12,000 per capita, my friends, per citizen.

In our country when England decided to impose taxation without representation, the colonies decided they would be colonies no more. They passed a resolution saying, "No taxes ever have been or can be constitutionally imposed on them" by their respective legislatures.

Look at this graph; it speaks for itself, it speaks for the residents of the District of Columbia.

□ 1015

RECOGNIZING A RURAL ELECTRIC VOLUNTEER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and to thank a power lineman from Dixon, Missouri, for facilitating the advent of safe, reliable, and affordable electricity for a community in Haiti.

His service and sacrifice will improve the lives of many people because electricity is a critical element to improving the quality of life, health care, education, clean water, and other vital services.

I would like to recognize Karl Brandt, who works for Gascosage Electric Cooperative. Volunteering his time and expertise for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's International Foundation, he spent 2 weeks in the town of Caracol, providing safety training and mentoring for local Haitian linemen.

Mr. Brandt also assisted with installing power for residences located next to an industrial park in Caracol. When fully functional, this industrial park will have the capacity to employ 30,000 people. Only about 13 percent of the

people in Haiti have reliable access to electricity.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association International has been working on a USAID-funded program to bring electricity to the town of Caracol and to nearby areas in north-eastern Haiti.

Today, more than 1,200 consumers in the town of Caracol have access to reliable electricity. According to the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, some homes here now have antennas for TVs; small businesses, like Internet cafes, have been established; and water treatment plants are in operation.

Mr. Brandt, we thank you for your service.

TAKE MARIJUANA OUT OF THE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last week, Attorney General Holder said that he would be happy to work with Congress to reexamine how marijuana is scheduled under Federal statutes.

That is a thoughtful effort, but I hope the Attorney General realizes that the time for examination and re-examination has passed. It is now time for him and the administration to act.

The jury has returned its verdict on medical marijuana. More than a million patients use it in managing chemotherapy symptoms, chronic pain, PTSD in our soldiers, and epilepsy, particularly in severe epilepsy that afflicts children; 70 percent of Americans think that medical marijuana should be legal, and I honestly believe that, if the other 30 percent had a child who was subject to these severe epileptic seizures or if a loved one had unbearable chronic pain, they would come around as well.

Marijuana is currently listed as a schedule I drug. That is the same classification as heroin or as LSD. It is higher than cocaine or methamphetamines. This makes no sense whatsoever. No one dies from a marijuana overdose, and the alleged less dangerous methamphetamines have been ravaging communities, particularly in rural and smalltown America, and people do die, and people do commit violent acts.

The Attorney General has called on Congress to act, and in fact, we have. Working in a bipartisan way, we have introduced a variety of bills that do everything from creating a regulatory framework to tax marijuana, to bills to protect State marijuana laws from Federal interference, to legalizing the production of industrial hemp; but the dysfunction of Congress has kept these simple, commonsense bills from passing to this point.

What we need is for the Attorney General and those who work for him at

the DEA to at least move marijuana off the schedule I or the schedule II of controlled substances. This is something they can do under their own initiative.

Relisting or delisting marijuana could make it easier for researchers to gain access to the drug. It will allow marijuana businesses, which are perfectly legal in over 20 States, to deduct their business expenses like all other legal businesses.

It could give States more flexibility in dealing with it as a public health issue, and it would reflect what every teenager in America knows—but apparently what the DEA does not know—marijuana is not more dangerous than cocaine and methamphetamines, and to pretend otherwise means that young people and the general public will take the DEA less seriously.

I am inviting the Attorney General to visit us here on Capitol Hill, or we will go to his office to go over these points in person with a bipartisan group that has been working on these issues, whose advice and counsel should be helpful to him.

However, the easiest path forward for the Attorney General remains the same: take marijuana off the schedule I. A cab ride to Capitol Hill is not going to change that. We hope we can see some action and see it soon.

WALT RICHARDSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life of Chief Master Sergeant Walter H. Richardson, United States Air Force, Retired, who passed away on March 29, 2014.

Walt—who built his life on three pillars of faith, hope, and love—was dedicated to his country, his community, his family, and above all, to the Lord. I am privileged to honor a truly remarkable man and an American hero.

Born and raised in Pensacola, Florida, Walt joined the Armed Forces to serve his country and help provide for his family. His career in the Armed Forces spanned 30 years and included service in the Korean and Vietnam wars.

Walt was an original member of the revered Tuskegee Airmen, training at Tuskegee Army Airfield in a variety of disciplines that would serve him well throughout his entire career. A few years ago, I had the honor of presenting Walt the Congressional Gold Medal for his service as a Tuskegee Airman.

During his time in the military, Walt was one of over 1,000 enlisted men selected to integrate the Armed Forces. Walt's unwavering commitment to service and immense leadership skills were recognized when, while stationed at Dover Air Force Base, he became the first African American to be promoted to the rank of master sergeant in the field maintenance squadron.

He retired at the highest enlisted rank in the Air Force, chief master ser-

geant, as the senior enlisted adviser to the commanding general of the 1st Special Operations Wing at Hurlburt Field in Florida.

Beyond his military service, Walt was an accomplished writer, whose personal memoir is titled, "How Great Thou Art: A Black Boy's Depression-Era Success Story," in addition to his being a dedicated member of the north-west Florida community as he served as a deacon of St. Mary Parish in Fort Walton Beach for over three decades.

Walt was known throughout the gulf coast as a kind and warmhearted man who was always helping his fellow citizens. To his family, he was a loving and devoted husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather.

The legacy left by Walt Richardson and his fellow Tuskegee Airmen had a profound impact on the course of our history.

Our Nation is proud and grateful for the brave men and women like Walt Richardson, who stared into the face of racial discrimination and said: We are one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Walt led an exemplary life of courage, service, patriotism, and devotion to faith and family, and his service to God, family, and country will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am humbled to honor Chief Master Sergeant Walter H. Richardson, United States Air Force, Retired.

My wife, Vicki, and I send our sincerest condolences to his wife of 60 years, Helen; to his eight children, Walter, Pat, Lillie, Carmen, Henri, Donna, William, and Carl; to their nine grandchildren; to their four great-grandchildren; and to the entire Richardson Family.

THE RYAN BUDGET: AN ATTACK ON AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House begins deliberations on the majority's budget for fiscal year 2015, better known as the Ryan budget. Sadly, it is reminiscent of the same misguided policy proposals rejected by the American people time after time.

A budget is a moral document, a roadmap to fiscal stability, and the security of the social safety net. The majority's budget does neither. It is not a serious document, and it is not responsible.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, nearly 70 percent of the cuts included in the majority's budget come from programs serving low- and middle-income American families, programs like Pell grants, SNAP, and Medicaid; yet no cuts were made from defense funding. Instead, it received a near \$500 million increase. Most would agree that a nation's budget reflects its priorities.

The majority's budget is a clear sign that economic prosperity for all is simply not that important, that equality is not that important. Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are focused on shrinking the government at any cost—at all costs—even if it means doing so on the backs of the most vulnerable among us.

The CBC substitute budget takes a different approach by offering a plan that reduces the deficit and alleviates the harm inflicted by sequestration in a responsible and fiscally sound way.

The CBC substitute is focused on making our government work smarter and our programs operate more efficiently. It provides a plan to turn our country's economy around and to open the door of opportunity for future generations.

The CBC substitute includes initiatives that would provide immediate assistance to all Americans, like extending emergency unemployment insurance and raising the Federal minimum wage while also mapping out a long-term agenda for future economic growth.

It reinforces support for critical safety net programs, provides resources to address persistent poverty, rebuilds our transportation infrastructure, and promotes domestic manufacturing.

The CBC substitute proposes reforms to make our Tax Code more fair. Our budget eliminates a number of special tax breaks that benefit the wealthiest Americans, and it closes the international tax loopholes that move American jobs overseas. The CBC proposed tax reforms would save \$2 trillion over a 10-year period and would create jobs.

By passing the CBC substitute, Congress can stimulate the economy while expanding the middle class. To my colleagues in the House, we have a blueprint. Let's build a better America together and move closer to giving everyone a budget and a country of which we can be proud.

IN HONOR OF MILLARD AND J.J. OAKLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor two beloved Tennesseans who have dedicated their lives and service to our State, Millard and Joyce Annette Oakley.

A lifelong resident of Overton County and a graduate from Tennessee Tech University, Millard Oakley is a true jack-of-all-trades. He proudly represented the Upper Cumberland for four terms in the Tennessee General Assembly, and he continued his service as a member of the Tennessee Board of Regents and as the State insurance commissioner.

Today, he ensures that small businesses in our district have the capital needed to expand their reach and hire

more workers as the director of the First National Bank of Tennessee; and he helps spread the gospel message as the director for the Thomas Nelson Publishers, the world's largest Bible publishing company.

His loving wife, Joyce, or J.J., as she is known, is a West Virginia native, but she got to Tennessee just as soon as she could and met her husband-to-be while attending the University of Tennessee law school.

While the Oakleys' accomplishments are many, they are best known for their generosity to the students and families of my district. In 2004, the Oakleys sponsored a Vince Gill concert that helped Tennessee Tech University raise more than \$140,000 for the new nursing school.

They also offered Tennessee Tech the use of their family farm and donated \$2 million to fund the school's Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Center, the largest single gift in the university's history.

Additionally, the Oakleys were instrumental in recruiting a satellite campus of Volunteer State Community College to Livingston and gave generously to causes such as the Overton County Public Library.

□ 1030

Today, the Oakleys can still be seen around my district visiting the library that bears their name or walking on the campus of Tennessee Tech and meeting students who have personally benefited from their contributions.

People like Millard and J.J. Oakley truly earn Tennessee its nickname of the "Volunteer State."

I am deeply grateful for their friendship and their example of selfless generosity. May we all aspire to live such a life.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT AWARENESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I have spent a fair amount of time on the House floor talking about sexual harassment, sexual assault, and rape in the military; in fact, I have spoken 30 times about that issue. But it is apparent that we also need to spend some time talking about sexual harassment in this Chamber.

This is the Congress of the United States of America. This is the House of Representatives of the United States of America. This is not a frat house.

Regrettably, this week, another one of our colleagues was discovered engaged in inappropriate action with a member of his staff. This is not the first time. It will probably not be the last time. It happens on the Republican side. It happens on the Democratic side. That doesn't make it okay.

Almost 25 years ago, Anita Hill testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee. There were six male Senators

that questioned her. They suggested that she somehow had wanted it or was lying. I was so mad. I remember watching that testimony and throwing my slipper at the television. That was in 1991.

The following year, 1992, was called the Year of the Woman in Congress. Women were mad. That year, more women were elected to Congress than ever before. In fact, in California, we elected two U.S. Senators: Senators DIANNE FEINSTEIN and BARBARA BOXER.

It is time for us to recognize that we have a problem. It is not okay to fondle a staff member. It is not okay to make suggestive comments to a staff member. It is not okay to have provocative pictures on your computer. It is just not okay to conduct ourselves in that manner.

Today, I am introducing a bill that I have been working on for some time that will require that every Member of this House and every staff member participate in a training on sexual harassment at least once every 2 years.

We are only asking ourselves to do what is being done by over 60 percent of the corporations in this country. In fact, in California, I carried legislation that required the posting of signage in every corporation about what sexual harassment was, the rights and responsibilities around it, and what steps you could take if it happened. We then took steps to make sure every member of the State legislature was subject to sexual harassment training at least once every 2 years.

Here in Congress, there is an Office of Compliance. Ironically, the Office of Compliance is where you might report sexual harassment, but then the Office of Compliance is responsible for protecting the office. Go figure.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for us to clean up our act. It is time.

DISASTROUS EFFECTS OF RYAN REPUBLICAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I feel compelled to talk to you today about the disastrous effects the Ryan budget would have on our country's research and development enterprise and, consequently, the disastrous effect this budget would have on America's future competitiveness.

As others have pointed out, the Republican budget cuts nondefense discretionary spending by \$1.3 trillion below the baseline 2014 spending level, adjusted for inflation. These are massive cuts on top of a budget that has already had large reductions in recent years.

The effects on research and development would be dramatic. The American Association for the Advancement of

Science estimates that the Ryan budget would cut civilian research and development by \$92 billion from the current baseline and \$112 billion below the President's budget request.

These are striking reductions. Please keep in mind that the National Science Foundation's total annual budget is just over \$7 billion. The Republican budget cuts more research and development funding every year than the entire annual budget of the National Science Foundation.

This is insanity. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have truly divorced themselves from reality if they think these cuts to research and development won't cripple our country for decades to come.

Let's talk about what the Republicans want to cut.

It is estimated that technological innovation has led to the majority of America's economic growth since World War II. Much of this innovation has been funded by the Federal Government.

Think back to the first grants that NASA gave Robert Noyce's upstart company in the 1960s. Of course, he went on to be the founder of Intel, the largest computer chip maker in the world. Or think of the NSF research grant that led to the creation of Google. The very Internet itself was initially funded as a research project by the Department of Defense and rolled out by the National Science Foundation.

You can look at virtually every aspect of our high-tech industry and the economy and find a connection to Federal research and development funding. To make dramatic and drastic cuts to R&D funding in the name of deficit reduction is truly shortsighted.

My friend and former CEO of Lockheed Martin, Norm Augustine, frequently gives the following analogy. When an airplane is overloaded and too heavy to fly, you don't cut weight by chopping off the engines. I think that is a great analogy, because that is exactly what this budget does. It cuts off the engine of American innovation.

It would be bad enough if these deep cuts only affected research and development, but the Ryan budget will also painfully cut education funding. Indexed for inflation, that budget would cut hundreds of billions of dollars from precollege and college education programs.

Let's put these education cuts in context.

In the last international student assessment, U.S. students ranked 26th in mathematics and 21st in science. We are falling behind our economic competitors in STEM education. The Republican solution to this problem is to throw in the towel. These educational cuts sell our children out, plain and simple.

Taken together, the cuts to research and education in this Ryan budget paint a dark picture of America's future. It is a picture where America no

longer leads the world in innovation. It is a picture where our children are not prepared for the rigors of a competitive 21st century global marketplace. It is a picture of America in decline.

I reject this future. I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the Ryan Republican budget that sells America short and, instead, show support for robust education and research funding and a strong American future.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Ryan Republican budget and in support of the alternative budget plan that has been submitted by the Congressional Black Caucus.

The CBC budget is an effort to take a balanced approach to deficit reduction; the GOP budget balances itself on the backs of children, college students, working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, and the afflicted.

The CBC budget would move America forward; the GOP budget would take us backward.

The CBC budget is designed to create progress for the greatest number of Americans possible; the GOP budget is designed to promote prosperity for the few.

As we engage in this budget debate, we should be here on the floor of the House of Representatives trying to find ways to promote the American Dream for the middle class and for those who aspire to be part of it. Instead, the Ryan Republican budget is a nightmare for far too many Americans.

My good friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, may suggest that when we use language such as that, it is hyperbole. Let's examine what the Ryan Republican budget actually does, because I believe, when you put it to an evidence-based analysis, one can come to no other conclusion than it will result in a nightmare for far too many Americans.

The Ryan Republican budget would cut more than \$125 billion in food and nutritional assistance for food-insecure Americans. In this great country of ours, the richest in the world, there are more than 50 million Americans every day who wake up hungry and food insecure. Approximately 16 million of those hungry Americans are children. Yet the Ryan Republican budget would cut \$125 billion in assistance to these Americans. That is a nightmare.

The Ryan Republican budget would also cut approximately \$260 billion in funding for higher education, essentially robbing the capacity of so many younger Americans to pursue the American Dream of getting a college education.

In this country, there is already more than \$1 trillion in collective stu-

dent loan debt. That is more than \$1 trillion. That reality, Mr. Speaker, means that so many younger Americans have an inability when they graduate from college to purchase a home, to start a family, to create small businesses. We are robbing these Americans of a viable future. And \$260 billion in cuts to higher education funding, it seems to me, is a nightmare for younger Americans.

The Ryan Republican budget would also cut \$732 billion from Medicaid. Almost two-thirds of the recipients of Medicaid are actually seniors, the sick, the disabled, and the afflicted. Don't believe this caricature that people like to create as it relates to Medicaid. Seniors, the sick, the afflicted, and the disabled benefit from Medicaid, and the Ryan Republican budget would cut \$732 billion over a 10-year period from this vital social safety net program? That is a nightmare for the American people.

□ 1045

So this is not hyperbole. Unfortunately, this is reality.

I would urge my colleagues to take a real close look at the Congressional Black Caucus alternative, a fair and balanced alternative, a budget that would invest in job training and education, invest in transportation and infrastructure, invest in research and development, invest in technology and innovation, invest in the American people and our future.

That is why I am urging a "no" vote on the Ryan Republican budget and a "yes" vote on the CBC alternative.

WHAT YOU DON'T KNOW CAN HURT YOU

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is said that what you don't know won't hurt you. What you don't know won't hurt you. I disagree.

What you don't know about health care can hurt you. What you don't know about a treatable condition that can harm you, possibly kill you, what you don't know about it can hurt you.

I don't believe in the idiom, the adage, what you don't know won't hurt you. I believe you should know the truth because the truth can set you free.

So let us take a moment now and look at just one aspect of what is called the Ryan budget. Let's look at health care. The Ryan budget repeals the Affordable Care Act. It repeals it without replacing it.

What you don't know can hurt you. But if you know the truth, it can liberate you. We need to get the truth to the masses so that the masses can understand the impact of repealing without replacing.

Let's reflect upon 2009, when we embarked upon the task of developing an Affordable Care Act. In 2009, we were spending \$2.5 trillion per year on

health care. \$2.5 trillion is a very large number, and it is difficult to get your mind around it. However, \$2.5 trillion is \$79,000 a second. \$79,000 a second is what we were spending.

17.6 percent of the GDP, \$100 billion being spent on persons without insurance in various venues, emergency rooms, and other places. It was projected that by 2018 we would spend \$4.4 trillion per year.

Know the truth. It can liberate you.

\$4.4 trillion is \$139,000 per second; estimated that it would be about 20.3 percent of GDP.

In 2009 we had 40 to 50 million people uninsured, depending on who is counting and how you count. In 2009 we had 45,000 people per year dying because they didn't have insurance. This is per Harvard University. One person dying every 12 minutes.

In 2009, in the State of Texas we had 6 million people uninsured, and 20 percent of the children in the State of Texas uninsured.

We had to do something about health care if, for no other reason, to simply bend the cost curve. And the cost curve is bending. It is projected that, in the first 10 years, it would bend the cost curve about \$100 billion, and in the next 10 years, \$1 trillion.

Know the truth, and the truth can liberate you, my dear friends. The truth is this: if the Ryan budget repeals the Affordable Care Act and it is not replaced—and there is no replacement provision in that budget—seniors who are on Medicare are going to see the doughnut hole expand rather than close.

The doughnut hole is that point at which seniors have to pay more for prescription drugs, more than many can afford. What you don't know can hurt you, seniors, when the doughnut hole starts to expand.

The budget would cause those who are 26 years of age, under 26 years of age, who are on policies of their parents, to come off.

Young people are invincible until they have an accident and get hurt and need health care. They are invincible until they find out they have a condition that is curable and they need health care.

Young people, what you don't know can hurt you. But the truth can liberate you so that you can do the right thing as it relates to this budget and let people know that you are opposed to what can happen to you.

This budget will cause preexisting conditions to become an uninsurable circumstance in your life. There are people who are born with preexisting conditions. These people will not be insurable. The Affordable Care Act eliminates preexisting conditions as a reason not to ensure people.

We would go back to people being born with preexisting conditions, many of whom would have to wait until they can afford or get to Medicare before they could get insurance. Medicare is a type of insurance.

This budget would cause women to, again, have to go back to a circumstance wherein they, by virtue of their condition of being a woman, would have a preexisting condition.

Mr. Speaker, I will put a "to be continued" in this message. But what you don't know can hurt you. The truth can set you free.

God bless you.

PEARL S. BUCK INTERNATIONAL AND THE CHILDREN IN FAMILIES FIRST ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the Pulitzer Prize-winning novelist, noted humanitarian, and longtime Bucks County, Pennsylvania, resident, Pearl S. Buck, touched many lives during her lifetime.

Her books brought readers inside the worlds of those they might have never known, and her commitment to a global community devoid of prejudice and bias solidified her place in American history.

However, it was her dedication to children of all races for which I recognize her today. Pearl S. Buck pioneered a process for international adoption that brought down the walls of interracial adoption and grew loving families, where, before, there were no options.

Her work continues today, and it continues with the leaders at Pearl S. Buck International in my district. Through the "Welcome House program" and adoption assistance, the organization carries on her critical mission of connecting children worldwide with loving families here in the United States.

I was proud to join the leaders at Pearl S. Buck International last month to highlight our mutual support for the Children in Families First Act. This bipartisan legislation streamlines our Nation's international adoption process and increases America's diplomatic mission abroad to include the well-being of children around the globe.

As a member of the Congressional Adoption Coalition and a cosponsor of the bill, I am excited to advance the Children in Families First Act as a commonsense response to the needs of families and groups like Pearl S. Buck International.

By removing roadblocks, increasing USAID opportunities, and prioritizing adoption within the State Department, we can ensure that every child, no matter where they are born, has a home.

THE POWER OF THE INTERNET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come to

the floor this morning and talk just a little bit about free speech and how we exercise that free speech in this country.

I think it is no secret that the Twitterverse and the Internet has been abuzz with a little bit of concern about what the President is planning to do about the Internet and control and governance of the Internet.

I think we all agree that the Internet has had a revolutionary impact on not only this Nation but on the world. You can take a look at what has happened with jobs, with innovation, with economic freedom, and, indeed, with social change.

You see it pronounced because the Internet allows people to participate from the bottom up, receiving information about what their governments are doing, about opportunities that are out there. They have the opportunity to get online and do a little bit of research.

So, with this open ecosystem and this decentralized nature of information, it is benefiting freedom. It is benefiting free people and free markets. We want to see that continue.

Now, like many of my colleagues, I do support a free market, multistakeholders model of Internet governance. And in a perfect world, ICANN, which is the organization with governance of domain names and of the Internet, and IANA would be fully privatized and free from any government influence or control.

However, realistically, we know that China and Russia have a very different view of what would be perfection. Their end goal is to have ICANN and IANA functions migrate to the U.N.'s ITU, which is the International Telecommunications Union. That solution is one that I do not support and one that I would never stand in favor of. I stand in opposition to it.

If the U.S. Department of Commerce is going to relinquish control of its contractual authority over the IANA contract and move control of DNS into a global, multistakeholder community, the timing and the architecture would just have to be absolutely perfect.

This is an area where you have only got one shot of getting it right, only one shot, and we have to make certain that it is a shot that is focused fully on freedom.

If this administration wants to prove to Congress and the international community that they are serious about this process, then they must immediately move to bring an end to the net neutrality movement that is alive and well at our Federal Communications Commission.

Telling Congress and the international community that they are serious about relinquishing control over the IANA contract while simultaneously having the FCC work to promote net neutrality is disingenuous.

While we know Russia has got a land grab going on, we also see the U.N. and the ITU trying to carry forth this space grab.

A lot of our colleagues come to us, Mr. Speaker, and they say, so what are we going to do about this?

I want to highlight two different pieces of legislation with you; first, H.R. 4342. This is the Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters Act, DOTCOM Act. Congressmen SHIMKUS and ROKITA have joined me in this effort.

What we would do is to make certain that there is a prohibition against the Department of Commerce's National Telecommunications Information Administration—we call it NTIA here—from turning over its domain name system oversight responsibilities pending a GAO report to Congress.

Let's put this report in front of the action. Let's have a great discussion about what taking that action of relinquishing oversight would mean to each and every person that is assembled in this great room.

How is it going to affect our constituents?

How is it going to affect American innovation?

Let's have those discussions now. Let's not make a mistake.

I also highlight H.R. 4070, a piece of legislation I have authored, the Internet Freedom Act, to bar the FCC and their actions on net neutrality.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

If long ago all people had taken Your holy Word seriously—"make justice your aim"—how different history might be. Each day would be filled with promise and hope if all of us, upon rising, would make justice our aim.

Lord, if we as a people and as a nation were to make justice our aim, how would this change our priorities? Could we change that much?

In every age, Your impelling Spirit called our ancestors beyond their wishful thinking and beyond themselves to move ever closer to our national calling of "equal justice under the law."

Send that same Spirit upon the Members of this people's House that they, who have been entrusted with ensuring this great calling, might fulfill that

great promise, and it will truly come to pass that justice would roll down like a river and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GARCIA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, again, to support equal pay for equal work.

Republicans and Democrats share the conviction that no one should lose wages on account of one's sex. As is so often the case in this politically polarized city, though, the broad agreement on the goal does not extend to the methods we should use to get there.

Under the guise of equal pay, our Democrat colleagues would have us pass more rules, institute more red tape, and create more grounds for lawyers to drag businessowners into court. Perhaps there is a certain logic to this "regulate everything" approach.

After all, as The New York Times reported today, the President hasn't even been able to equalize pay between men and women in his own White House.

However, this President's ongoing regulatory blitzkrieg has helped to equalize the wages of 6.7 percent of the population—the unemployed.

WATER WEEK

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Water Week in order to recognize the critical need for clean water in our Nation.

In my western New York community, we understand the link between the health of the Great Lakes and the economic vitality of our region.

Studies have shown that nutrients, like phosphorus and nitrogen, are the cause of harmful algal blooms in the Great Lakes. In order to fight this, I have introduced the Great Lakes Nutrient Removal Assistance Act, which would provide \$500 million in funding to upgrade wastewater treatment plants in the Great Lakes Basin with nutrient removal technology.

Madam Speaker, the Great Lakes contain 95 percent of America's freshwater, and they supply drinking water to more than 30 million people in North America. Additionally, the Great Lakes support 1.5 million jobs and \$62 billion in wages annually.

The protection of the Great Lakes is essential, and I commend local advocates, like the Buffalo Niagara Riverkeeper and others, who are in Washington, D.C., this week for Water Week, as well as those who work tirelessly to protect our water resources for the well-being of our Nation.

THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD MUST BE LIMITED

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, tomorrow, the House Education and the Workforce Committee will mark up two bills to protect all American workers by limiting the National Labor Relations Board's expansion into the workforce.

The Workforce Democracy and Fairness Act restricts the Big Business, Big Government NLRB and reaffirms the protections that workers and job creators have received by promoting a fully informed union election process.

The Employee Privacy Protection Act gives workers greater control over the disclosure of personal information and helps modernize an outdated election process by replacing current rules that leave workers at risk of intimidation and coercion.

For years, the President's Big Labor bully has threatened to destroy jobs, such as at Boeing in north Charleston, and to invade American workers' privacy and encroach upon their rights.

I am grateful to the Education and the Workforce chairman, JOHN KLINE, and to the subcommittee chairman, Dr. PHIL ROE, for their dedication in promoting the rights of every American worker and in protecting American job creators.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

EQUAL PAY DAY

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of Equal Pay Day.

Fifty-one years ago, the Equal Pay Act was signed into law. Still, women

in my home State of Hawaii, where women have traditionally been part of the workforce—like my two grandmothers who worked in the sugarcane fields—still earn 82 cents to the dollar earned by a man.

Equal pay is not just a woman's issue. It is a family and a community issue. Women are one-half of the paid workforce. Two-thirds of the women are either primary or cobreadwinners for their families, but women are two-thirds of the workforce who are earning minimum wage.

Closing the wage gap cuts poverty in half, and women and their families then benefit. Nearly half a trillion dollars is then added to our economy.

Remember, the President said, when women succeed, America succeeds.

Please bring H.R. 377, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to the floor.

VENEZUELA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak for those who are being violently muzzled by the autocratic Maduro regime in Venezuela.

This regime has used every arm of the state to attack its political opponents, resulting in at least 39 dead and many more imprisoned.

One of these leaders is Leopoldo Lopez, whom we can see in this poster, who has been unjustly detained in a military prison for almost 7 weeks and who now faces a 14-year prison sentence just for protesting peacefully to promote democratic principles.

The arrest of Leopoldo Lopez has nothing to do with justice and everything to do with silencing the political opposition and the Venezuelans' call for democracy; yet the Obama administration still has not taken any action against Maduro, and it has failed to hold human rights violators accountable.

This communicates a dangerous indifference that is painful not only to the Venezuelan people, but to all who care about freedom and human rights, and it further erodes the little credibility we have on the international stage.

Let's listen to the people of Venezuela.

A GOOD DAY FOR OUR NATION'S SENIORS

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, I have always been a strong supporter of Medicare for the simple reason that our Nation's seniors deserve to keep their hard-earned health care.

That is why we have been working on a bipartisan basis to fight any potential cuts to Medicare and Medicaid.

I am pleased to announce that, yesterday, the administration reversed potential cuts to these health care plans.

I would like to say a few words in Spanish:

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows.)

Mr. Speaker, I always have and always will support Medicare for the simple reason that our nation's seniors deserve to keep their hard-earned health care.

That is why I have been working on a bipartisan basis to fight any potential cuts to Medicare.

I am pleased to say that the Administration stepped up yesterday and reversed potential cuts to Medicare Advantage health plans.

I'd like to say a few words in Spanish for my Spanish language constituents.

Siempre he apoyado y voy a seguir apoyando a Medicare porque creo que las personas mayores de nuestro país merecen mantener su seguro de salud que han ganado.

Por esa razón es que he colaborado con mis colegas de ambos lados para combatir los cortes potenciales de Medicare.

Me complace anunciar que la Administración escuchó nuestras preocupaciones y ayer eliminaron los posibles recortes a los planes de salud de Medicare Advantage.

Es un buen día para los mayores de nuestra nación.

It is a good day for our Nation's seniors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida will provide the Clerk a translation of his remarks.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FULTON-MONTGOMERY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Fulton-Montgomery Community College on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

Since its founding, the number of students attending the college has grown from 350 to today's population of 2,850—remarkable growth. These students are now becoming specialists in one of 40 academic programs, including business, electrical technology, media communication, nursing, radiologic technology, and one in which I have had direct involvement, clean room science.

Under the current leadership of President Dusty Swanger—and I must add, he is a very effective leader and a much-respected leader—FMCC is the region's partner for quality, accessible higher education, economic development, and cultural and intellectual enrichment.

Although the institution officially turned 50 in September, this is truly a year of celebration as the school continues to grow and boost our communities in the greater capital region of New York.

Again, I congratulate the FMCC administration, faculty, support staff,

and students for their hard work each and every day, which makes us very proud.

NATIONAL CIVIL RIGHTS MUSEUM

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, on Saturday, the National Civil Rights Museum in Memphis was reopened. It is a spectacular display with all of the up-to-date technologies of civil rights in America, from the Middle Passage to April 4, 1968, which was the assassination of Martin Luther King at the Lorraine Motel, the site of the museum.

As I toured the fabulous museum, I thought about how far America had come and how much farther it needs to go. There are stories about the Voting Rights Act; yet I thought about the Supreme Court's striking down provisions and about the impossibility of getting sponsors here sufficient to pass a renewed Voting Rights Act, which is so necessary to America's fulfilling its purpose.

I thought about the Affordable Care Act and efforts to repeal it, to simply give health care to individuals, many of whom are poor and haven't had health care before. I thought about jobs bills because, without economic justice, you don't have social justice in full effect.

You need infrastructure bills. You need minimum wage, and you need unemployment insurance. We have a long way to go to fulfill Dr. King's dream.

I am pleased the museum reopened. It is spectacular. I urge all people to come to Memphis and visit it, and I urge all people to think about Dr. King and to try to fulfill his dream by passing those measures that are necessary.

BUDGET WEEK

(Mr. WOODALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I come to the House floor today, actually, with three of my constituents from Lawrenceville—Keeran and Hailey and Ashley—because this is budget week. This is when we decide what our priorities are, and there is not going to be a man or a woman in this Chamber who does not believe that what we do, we do for this next generation of Americans.

The question will be: What do we do?

The rule that we are going to take up here this afternoon is going to make every single substitute amendment offered in this Chamber available for a vote on this floor, so that America can see what our priorities are and can choose among them.

Madam Speaker, this is the very best of our Republic that will be on display this week, budget week, and I am just pleased and honored to be a part of it.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 8, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 8, 2014 at 8:50 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2195.

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 3979.

Appointments:

Joint Committee on Taxation.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 8, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 8, 2014 at 10:35 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 92.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1215

ELECTING CERTAIN MEMBERS TO
CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES
OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 546

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mr. Byrne.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Johnson of Ohio.

Mr. WOODALL (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H. CON. RES. 96, CONCURRENT
RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015, AND
PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS
DURING THE PERIOD FROM
APRIL 11, 2014, THROUGH APRIL
25, 2014

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 544 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 544

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Brady of Texas and Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from April 11, 2014, through April 25, 2014—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 5. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Thursday, April 17, 2014, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, it is budget week. I have been trying to contain my smile all week long. I have the great pleasure of sitting on both the Budget Committee and the Rules Committee here in this House. The rule that we have before us today, House Resolution 544, does candidly what I think my friend from Massachusetts and I came here to do, and that is to have an open debate on the floor of the House about absolutely everyone's ideas.

I want to tell you what that means, Madam Speaker, because we sit on the Rules Committee, my friend from Massachusetts and I, and part of that responsibility is deciding whose voice gets heard and whose doesn't. It is a very solemn responsibility, one that neither of us takes lightly. I believe we would both say that whenever possible we should err on the side of having more voices instead of less. What we have today, Madam Speaker, is a rule that provides for absolutely every budget alternative written, drafted, and presented in this House, every one.

I want you to think about that, Madam Speaker, because this ought to be a place where we debate ideas. This ought to be a place where we talk about what tomorrow looks like, how can we make tomorrow better than today. And on this day, we will be voting on a rule that will make every single alternative idea available for robust debate on the floor of this House.

Now, the underlying bill is the bill that came out of the Budget Committee. Again, Madam Speaker, in full disclosure, I am a member of that Budget Committee. I am proud of the work that that committee put out.

Some folks call it the Paul Ryan budget. I take umbrage at that. I sit on that committee. I work shoulder to shoulder with PAUL. I am going to call it the Budget Committee budget. I hope at the end of this budget week it will be the House-passed budget, because I think it reflects the priorities of this institution, and I think it reflects the priorities of the American people.

If it does not reflect the priorities of any Member in this Chamber, they will have alternatives to vote on. One of those alternatives is written and drafted by the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the lead Democrat on the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), that substitute amendment made in order today.

The Congressional Black Caucus, Madam Speaker, comes together to put together a list of priorities, a full substitute budget, has done that for a number of years, has done that again this year. This rule makes that Congressional Black Caucus substitute in order for a vote.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus, Madam Speaker, they have presented a budget. Now, their budget is one that raises taxes by \$5 trillion over the next 10 years. It is not going to be one that I support here on the floor of the House, but it is absolutely a legitimate list of priorities, as I talked about earlier, priorities that affect the young people of this Nation. We are going to get a vote on that budget here on the floor of this House.

The Republican Study Committee, Madam Speaker, of which I am also a member, a proud drafter of that budget document, that vote, espousing the absolute fastest path to balance that we will be hearing in this institution during budget week, Madam Speaker, will get a vote on the floor of this House.

Finally, a budget presented by Representative MULVANEY of South Carolina but intended to replicate the budget written by the President of the United States of America. It is a funny thing in constitutional government. Of course we have article I, legislative branch; article II, executive branch. Certainly, we have different responsibilities, but I don't think there is anyone in this Chamber who would say the President hasn't invested an incredible amount of time and energy presenting his budget. It wasn't here on time, but it did arrive here. It is a complete budget, and it deserves a hearing. No one on the Democrat side of the aisle picked up that budget to present it until Representative MULVANEY did. Again, I think that is part of the robust debate that we must have.

All together, we are going to have 4 hours of debate on these budget alter-

natives. That is in addition to all the regular order that has already gone on in committee, in addition to the hours that we have invested in the Rules Committee already, 4 hours here on the floor of this House.

Why is that important, Madam Speaker? Because I think what I will hear on both sides of the aisle is that these budgets represent a statement of values. Who are you going to take the money from? Who are you going to spend the money on? How are you going to invest in the future? How are you going to prevent the future from being eroded by payments on debt after debt, after debt, after debt? These are the discussions that we are going to have.

Just 10 years ago, Madam Speaker, the public debt in this country was \$7.3 trillion. Today, it is \$17.5 trillion—all of the debt that we have racked up in the history of this country through 2004 more than doubled in just the last 10 years.

Madam Speaker, there may be folks in this Chamber who say that is a debt worth making, that the investments that we are creating by borrowing this money from our children and spending it on the generations today, that that is worth doing. I say no. I say our obligation to our children tomorrow, to our grandchildren tomorrow is not to advance ourselves at their expense. I think our obligation is to pay down that debt, but that is a legitimate discussion that we are going to have over the next several days.

The \$10 trillion on the Nation's credit card in just the past 10 years, Madam Speaker, let there be no doubt that that is the gravity of the conversation that we are having today.

I remember back in 2012, Madam Speaker, President Obama said in an interview with ABC News: "We don't have an immediate crisis in terms of debt. In fact, for the next 10 years, it's going to be in a sustainable place." In 2012, the President predicting that for the next 10 years the crisis won't come, that the crisis will be out beyond year 10. Madam Speaker, he may be right, but that was 2 years ago, and there are only two bills, two budgets that we have before us this budget week that even balance in that 10-year window.

This is a debate worthy of this Chamber; this is a debate worthy of America. And I hope that by the end of budget week, Madam Speaker, by the time we take our vote on final passage, irrespective of which substitute has passed or whether the House-passed or committee-passed budget remains, that we have a document that represents not just this institution's values but that represents our constituents' values, that represents American values, that is true to the obligation that we all have to protect the opportunities of the generations of tomorrow.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from

Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, budgets are moral documents. These annual documents are really statements of who we are as political parties and as groups and as people. They represent our values. They tell a story about what we believe in and how we would govern.

I had thought that I had come here today to say that this budget before us, the Ryan budget, is simply bad or that it is misguided. Madam Speaker, it is much worse than that.

□ 1230

This is an awful budget. It takes our country in the fundamentally wrong direction.

It seems as though every year we shake our heads wondering how the latest Ryan budget could possibly get worse than the previous year's efforts. And yet, time after time, the Ryan budget manages to pull it off.

This budget is cruel, but sadly, it is not unusual.

The gentleman from Georgia says he can't contain his smiles when he talks about this budget. I don't think there is anything to smile about.

Year after year, the Ryan budget does more and more damage to the social fabric of our Nation. Year after year, it puts the wishes of the rich ahead of the needs of the poor. And year after year, it sacrifices the reality of desperately needed investments at the altar of theoretical deficit reduction.

Let's look at the details. The Ryan budget includes deep cuts. How deep? \$791 billion below the sequester number. \$791 billion below sequester. That is amazing, Madam Speaker.

Now, I voted against sequester because of the damage it would and it did inflict on our economy. This budget would actually cut nearly \$1 trillion on top of the sequester. I thought we wanted to end sequester, not make choices that are even worse.

But that is not the end of the story. According to one estimate, 69 percent of the Ryan budget cuts come from low-income programs. It would shred the safety net. The programs that keep millions of Americans out of poverty and help provide millions of Americans with health care, that will provide millions of children with school meals and early childhood education, received the lion's share of the cuts. That is what the Ryan budget does.

In fact, according to the same estimate, \$3.3 trillion of the Ryan budget's \$4.8 trillion in non-defense cuts come from low-income safety net programs like Medicaid, SNAP, school breakfast and lunch programs, Head Start, the Supplemental Security Income program, the Earned Income Tax Credit, and Child Tax Credits.

Sixty-nine percent of the total non-defense cuts come from these life-changing, indeed, lifesaving programs.

The Ryan budget is successful at one thing: it deepens the divide between the rich and poor in this country. It successfully makes life harder for those who are already struggling to make ends meet.

If you are hungry in America, you would see food benefits cut by \$137 billion.

If you are a middle class college student in America, hopefully you can win the lottery, or have a rich uncle, because Pell grants would be cut by \$125 billion by freezing the maximum grant and cutting eligibility.

If you are a low-income working mother in America who gets health care through Medicaid, you would join at least 40 million Americans who will become uninsured by 2024 after the Ryan budget cuts at least \$2.7 trillion from Medicaid.

And if you are a middle class family with kids in America just trying to get by in this sluggish economy, you would see your taxes go up by \$2,000.

But if you are fortunate enough to be very rich in America, you lucked out. It is time to pop the champagne because you make out like a bandit. The oil companies keep their tax breaks. Businesses can keep putting money in overseas accounts just to avoid paying taxes here in America.

And if you are a millionaire?

Get ready for a big fat check from Uncle Sam. That is because anyone making \$1 million a year will see a tax cut of at least \$200,000.

On top of these disastrous policies, the Ryan budget, once again, goes after seniors. This version, once again, ends the Medicare guarantee and reopens the Medicare prescription drug doughnut hole.

As a result of these cuts, seniors will see their traditional Medicare premiums soar by an average of 50 percent. As AARP says:

Removing the Medicare guarantee of affordable health coverage for older Americans by implementing a premium support system and asking seniors and future retirees to pay more is not the right direction.

Now these policies have real world ramifications. Last week, Madam Speaker, an incredibly strong and courageous group of women called the Witnesses to Hunger returned to Capitol Hill to talk about their struggles as low-income, working women trying to make ends meet.

It takes guts to come here to Capitol Hill to tell your story and challenge Members of Congress to do better, and that is exactly what these impressive women did. They told their stories. They talked about their struggles, and they challenged us to do more to help so they don't fall back into poverty.

These women, and the millions of Americans like them who work hard every day, don't earn enough to make ends meet. They are having to choose between rent and food and electricity.

These women and their children aren't line items in our budget. They aren't statistics in our reports. They are people, people who just want to have a roof over their heads, food on their tables, and an education system that will help their children learn and succeed.

They want to go to college and not have to worry about losing their scholarships just because they are a single mother and need to work a night job to feed their child.

These women, and millions of Americans, would be hurt, they would be devastated by the Ryan budget. I am glad there are people who are able to make a lot of money in this country. I have nothing against rich people, but we shouldn't penalize those who are struggling.

Madam Speaker, we should be providing ladders of opportunity to help people get out of poverty and move into the middle class. When people need a helping hand, we should provide that assistance, whether it is a job training program, early childhood education, health care, or something as simple and as basic as food.

These aren't handouts; they are hand-ups. They are investments in our future, and we should be providing opportunities to strengthen our communities and the middle class through job creation, higher education, and advancing research and innovation.

This is a great country. We have done great things, but we have begun to think small. That is what the Republican majority has succeeded in doing. They have got us to start thinking small rather than big. We don't tackle big problems anymore. We use deficit reduction as an excuse to do nothing.

What we need to do is tackle big issues like ending hunger. We should tackle the issue of ending poverty. We should want to strive for a country that benefits not just the few who are rich but the many who are poor.

The Ryan budget would set us back. It would do real damage to millions and millions of real Americans, our neighbors, our friends, our fellow parishioners.

As Pope Francis has written in his Papal Exhortation:

I ask God to give us more politicians capable of sincere and effective dialogue aimed at healing the deepest roots, and not simply the appearances of the evils in our world. Politics, though often denigrated, remains a lofty vocation and one of the highest forms of charity, inasmuch as it seeks the common good.

Inasmuch as it seeks the common good. This budget, this Ryan budget, this Republican budget, or whatever you want to call it, does not seek the common good. This budget fails that basic test that Pope Francis outlined. It does not seek the common good. It deserves to be defeated.

We can do so much better in this Congress and for our country. I am ashamed that this is what we are debating here today, that this is the Republican vision for our future.

This the wrong way to go. Democrats and Republicans should say "no" to this.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to say to my friend from Massachusetts, I believe we share many of the same priorities. But because of past Congresses, because of past administrations, because of past decisions that have been made in this Chamber, we are on track to spend \$6 trillion on interest over the next 10 years.

Madam Speaker, that is opportunity to fulfill every single one of those goals my friend from Massachusetts laid out that is frittered away by the borrow-and-spend behaviors of the past.

There is no disagreement in this Chamber about the commitment to a hand-up. The disagreement is about how much further out of reach we put opportunity and success by trading away future opportunities for spending today.

I have great respect and admiration for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have said yes, let's do raise taxes by \$5 trillion. Yes, let's do reset our priorities. Let's actually describe a pathway to a balanced budget. It is not an easy pathway to get to, but it matters.

It doesn't matter because it's a number, Madam Speaker. It matters because every year we don't balance the budget we steal opportunities from our children, and that is undeniable.

The debate is, Do the investments today outweigh those stolen opportunities from tomorrow? Or do the savings today that ensure that opportunity for tomorrow represent the best course of success that we can provide, again, for our children and grandchildren, about whom there is no disagreement about our strong and steadfast commitment?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think one of the differences between what the Republicans have proposed and what Democrats are proposing is that what they propose is just one thing—cuts. Cuts and cuts and cuts in programs for the most needy in this country, and more tax cuts for the most wealthy.

What the Democrats have proposed is a more balanced approach. Yeah, there needs to be some sacrifice, but we also understand the importance of investment.

If you want to find a way to balance the budget, why don't we find a cure for Alzheimer's disease? Not only would that help improve the quality of life for millions of people, but it would also eliminate all the fiscal problems that Medicaid has.

Let's find a cure for diabetes. Let's find a cure for cancer.

Why aren't our energies devoted toward investing in medical research?

And yet the Ryan budget that we are now debating would devastate medical research in this country. It would devastate it.

We have researchers coming in to visit us who are telling us that China is offering them a better package to do their medical research, Singapore. I want these cures to be found here in the United States. I want to invest in that research that will not only save people's lives, but create jobs and also save money.

Yet, my friends on the other side, they devastate investments in medical research. They devastate investments in scientific research. They devastate investments in transportation.

Their way is one way: cut programs that help the most needy, and give tax breaks to the Donald Trumps of the world. Donald Trump doesn't need any more help. Middle class families, those struggling to get into the middle class, do need help.

Madam Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question, and if we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 4415, the House companion to the unemployment insurance extension bill passed by a bipartisan majority in the Senate just yesterday. Representative KILDEE introduced this bill just hours after Senate passage.

Today, on Equal Pay Day, my amendment will also bring up H.R. 377, ROSA DELAUNO's Paycheck Fairness Act. It is shameful that women in America still make an average of only 77 cents for every dollar earned by their male colleagues. The Paycheck Fairness Act will require equal pay for equal work.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I join him in urging my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can immediately bring up H.R. 4415, which is identical to a bill that passed on a bipartisan basis by the Senate just last night.

It would extend emergency unemployment benefits to the 2 million Americans who have lost those benefits since Congress failed to act late last year.

I also will note that I read today a report that seven of my Republican House colleagues have written the Speaker urging him to bring this legislation up immediately as well. So we have bipartisan support for this effort to restore necessary benefits to individuals who have lost their job.

It takes an average of 37 weeks for someone who loses their job in this country to find their next opportunity. Yet, in my State, after 20 weeks, you are cut off of unemployment.

So while today is a beautiful spring day outside, and all across the country people are breathing in the optimism that comes with spring, for 2 million Americans, they look at this a dif-

ferent way. They go outside today and wonder if today is the day that the foreclosure notice will come, if today is the day that the eviction will be tacked on to their front door, if they will go outside and today will be the day that the car has been repossessed or that there won't be enough food to feed their family.

These are real-life Americans who are facing this struggle. We have it in our power to do something about it.

H.R. 4415, like the Senate action, is fully paid for. Despite the fact that, in the past, on a bipartisan basis, we have approved an unemployment insurance extension without it being paid for, this is paid for. It will not increase the deficit but will decrease the suffering of millions of American people who go every day trying to find their next job.

I have heard some on the other side say, well, we shouldn't do this because it is not an emergency. Well, if you are about to lose your house, or about to lose your apartment, or about to lose your car, or don't have enough food to feed your children, let me tell you, for them, maybe not for all of you, but for them it is an emergency, and this Congress can act, and it should act immediately.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, is it a constitutional right of the House to change the rules for consideration of a budget resolution as they are otherwise established in the Congressional Budget Act and were adopted in this Congress pursuant to H. Res. 5?

□ 1245

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House has the authority to adopt rules regarding its proceedings.

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker, does House Concurrent Resolution 96, which provides 4 hours of debate, supersede section 305(a) of the Budget Act, which provides for 10 hours of general debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not interpret a special order of business prior to or pending its consideration under the guise of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized to state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Rule XIII, clause 6(c) states that it is not in order for the Committee on Rules to report a rule that would prevent the motion to recommit from being made as provided in clause 2(b) of rule XIX.

Was it, therefore, in order under House rule XIII for the Committee on Rules to report H. Con. Res. 96?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot interpret the pending resolution under the guise of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized to state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, is a report from the Committee on Rules privileged under House rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending resolution was called up as privileged.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Is it in order to offer an amendment to the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An amendment may be offered at this point only if the majority manager yields for it.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, will House Concurrent Resolution 96 be considered under the hour rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the provisions of House Resolution 544.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to permit Representative CÁRDENAS to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I do not yield for that purpose. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia does not yield for that request.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Is it correct that on April 2, 2014, I offered an amendment to the concurrent resolution on the budget during the markup in the Budget Committee and all Republicans on the committee voted against it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot comment on proceedings in committee.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Does clause 3(b) of rule XIII, which requires committee reports to include—for record votes—the total number of votes cast for and against an amendment, as well as the names of Members voting for and against an amendment, apply to the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may consult the standing rules.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, is the requirement of House rule XIII, clause (b), that a committee report include the total number of votes cast for and against an amendment, as well as the names of Members voting for and against an amendment, enforceable through a point of order raised against the reported bill or resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may consult the standing rules.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Would a point of order lie against H. Res. 544 if the accompanying report, House Report 113-405 of the Rules Committee, did not include a record of the votes cast for and against an amendment, as well as the names of Members voting for and against an amendment, knowing that transparency is so fundamental to the rules of the House and the democratic process?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. House Resolution 544 is currently pending.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does either manager seek time for debate?

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

I believe that parliamentary inquiries are privileged. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Recognition for a parliamentary inquiry is within the discretion of the Chair.

Does either manager seek time for debate?

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I seek time for debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, there are often reasons to come to this floor and instruct the Rules Committee about how the Rules Committee could do better. We do the very best we can, but we accept constructive criticism from all comers.

The rule that is before us today is an example of what has gone right, not what has gone wrong. The rule that is before us today makes in order every single budget that was offered to the Rules Committee.

Now, I don't dispute that there are lots of different agendas that are being pursued here on the floor at this time; but for the budget agenda, for the openness agenda, for the full debate agenda, we have a rule before us that has made in order every single substitute offered in the Rules Committee, which happens to be five substitutes in addition to the base bill, but had there been more, we would have made more in order.

Again, there are lots of things that we can come to the floor of the House and disagree on, but this rule, to bring those disagreeing budgets to the floor, should be a point of great pride for both sides of the aisle.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, would a point of order lie against House Resolution 544 if it did not include a record of the courageous votes cast by Representative ROS-LEHTINEN in favor of allowing an amendment on comprehensive immigration reform?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is pending; therefore, the gentleman is asking for an advisory opinion. The Chair will not give an advisory opinion.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, is it correct that Representative CÁRDENAS' amendment, which made the necessary changes in the budget to accommodate passage of H.R. 15, the bipartisan Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, which lowers our deficits and secures our borders and establishes clear and just rules for citizenship, was not made in order under H. Res. 554?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may consult the Committee on Rules regarding its proceedings.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, is it correct that my amendment, known as the Cárdenas amendment, which also called for the House leadership to allow a vote on H.R. 15, the House's bipartisan comprehensive immigration bill, since the House majority had refused to bring it to the floor for a vote, was not made in order under House Resolution 544?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot comment on proceedings in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. How many cosponsors does H.R. 15 currently have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Further parliamentary inquiry.

How many of those cosponsors are Republican Members of the House of Representatives?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized to state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. How many Members have signed on to the discharge petition for H.R. 15?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may consult the petitions at the desk.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Further parliamentary inquiry on that note, Madam Speaker.

How many of those cosponsors are Republican Members?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may consult the discharge petitions at the desk.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Recognition for a parliamentary inquiry is within the discretion of the Chair.

The Chair is prepared to recognize the managers for debate.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the House Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I recognize why we are here and so do Members of this body, and the reason why is because, if you look at the pathway of the Democratic Party, which is what our colleagues are arguing for today, it is a pathway not only to destruction, but insolvency for the United States of America, up to and including Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and our ability to pay for the things that this great Nation needs.

Last night in the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), who is our representative to the Budget Committee, spent hours not only in understanding, talking, and debating these issues, but in making sure that he brought back a product that was worthy of the sale to the American people by the House of Representatives today.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is taking time to describe how, really, there are two different pathways that we could go down. Now, I am aware that we also made in order five other opportunities, opportunities where there are groups of people, Members who came to the Rules Committee upstairs, talked forthrightly about what was in their bills, and they were very proud of saying they wanted to raise taxes by trillions of dollars; they wanted to blame the ills and woes on a balanced budget and America doing something that was about solvency and a good future.

Here, we are on the floor today to talk about the pathways. One pathway where we can sustain what we do is called the Ryan budget. The chairman of the Budget Committee, PAUL RYAN, thoughtfully and carefully—I think

artfully—came and spoke about how we need to make sure that we continue to grow jobs in this country.

The alternative to that was higher taxes and putting more off on the American people to not only have to work harder for what they would earn, but less take-home pay.

We argued forthrightly about putting us on a pathway with our budget to where we could look at the energy resources of America, providing us with those opportunities to develop jobs and more revenue for the country.

Our friends on the Democratic side want to tax oil by billions of dollars, raising the price of energy. We forthrightly understand this, and we get it. We have seen energy prices double at the pump by President Obama and the Democrat leadership. We have seen food double in price.

No wonder it is difficult for average Americans to make ends meet. We have seen the Democrat Party, through their budget and through the actual laws that they have passed, diminish not only hours of work—which was the debate of the last few weeks about whether we would diminish the 40-hour workweek in favor of a 30-hour workweek.

There are two different pathways, two different directions we could go, taxing and spending, blaming people who have jobs, blaming millionaires and billionaires for the woes of America.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would submit to you today that it is the people who are innovative and creative and do well in life that create jobs and opportunities for this country, but they will quit doing so if we really tax them out of existence, if we do what the Democrats want to do and move to the pathway that means that America does not have a brighter future.

We will do exactly what we have seen is happening in Greece, in Iceland, and in France, where the brightest and the best of those people have given up on their countries because they cannot make a go of it.

Quite honestly, the Republican Party is proud of what we are doing. We are talking about how important it is to be careful and cautious, to make sure we can sustain what we do, to make sure that our promise to America's seniors on Medicare and Social Security is taken care of, not to go and make promises that we know we cannot fulfill.

On the other side, they turn right around and say: let's just go tax business, let's go tax energy, let's go tax people, those rich people.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is how you kill the goose that lays the golden egg. I have worked hard and never missed a day of work in 36 years.

I am not one of those people that they want to pick on, but I say thank goodness that we have entrepreneurs in our country who have chosen to make America home, who have chosen to employ American workers, and what the

Democrat Party wants to do with their budget is to throw us all out of work and make us beholden to them.

□ 1300

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, is it correct that the concurrent resolution on the budget fails to assume enactment of H.R. 15, immigration reform and, in doing so, squanders the opportunity to reduce taxes that Mr. SESSIONS just talked about to the tune of \$900 billion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman is engaging in debate.

Mr. CARDENAS. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker, isn't it true that unlike the concurrent resolution on the budget, which fails to balance in 10 years, H.R. 15, the House's bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill, would, according to the independent Congressional Budget Office, reduce our deficit by nearly \$1 trillion over the next 20 years?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman is engaging in debate.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, is it true that, unlike the concurrent resolution on the budget, which slashes the transportation budget by \$52 billion this year alone, and, according to the Economic Policy Institute, decreases GDP by 2.5 percent, H.R. 15, the House's comprehensive immigration reform bill, would create 120,000 jobs, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman is engaging in debate.

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker, is it correct that Ranking Member VAN HOLLEN's substitute amendment assumes the passage of immigration reform and that a vote against the Van Hollen substitute is a vote against immigration reform?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman is engaging in debate.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized to state a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Would it be in order to introduce an amendment to allow for an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of H.R. 15 as part of the budget?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment could only be offered at this point if the majority manager yielded for the amendment.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to allow for the consideration of the Cárdenas amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield.

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from California seek recognition?

Mr. CARDENAS. Permission to debate for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may be yielded to by a manager. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDENAS).

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to respond a little bit to what Congressman WOODALL just said a little while ago. The fact of the matter is that 68 Senators and a majority of the American people believe in debate and reform. When it comes to comprehensive immigration reform, it is about the budget. It is about the budget: 120,000 American jobs every year for the next 10 years, \$900 billion reduction in the deficit—in our deficit—the United States deficit.

That is why we need comprehensive immigration reform. It is about the budget, Madam Speaker and Members. I think it is important for us to understand that that would be the responsible—responsible—budget to pass, one that has comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I recognize that I need to hold some classes up at the Rules Committee so that Members have a better opportunity to understand more about the rules of the House and about how we operate on the floor. The facts of the case are very simple.

The Rules Committee last night made in order anything that was a complete substitute or an opportunity to have their bill heard last night. We do not take on what might be one single issue or literally an amendment.

The process that we are trying to follow here today is one that is happening

because, for 4 years, the Democratic Party had the Speaker of the House, the Senate Majority Leader, and the President of the United States, and they did not do for 4 years what they are asking us to do today. And all these shiny objects swirling around do not fool the American people. They want to raise taxes, raise spending, and blame someone rather than coming to the table and working together.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I think what you just saw on the floor is frustration. In the supposedly open House that my colleagues brag about—erroneously, I should add—this issue of comprehensive immigration reform has failed to be given a day on the floor.

The United States Senate, in a bipartisan way, passed comprehensive immigration reform, a bill that would, by the way, raise close to a trillion dollars over the next 20 years to pay down our debt, and yet we can't even get it scheduled on the House floor. The leadership here continues to block it, and Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. POLIS last night in the Rules Committee thought that, given the fact that there is such an incredible savings here, it was relevant to this.

And, by the way, the Rules Committee can do whatever it wants to. The Rules Committee could issue the necessary waivers to allow this to happen. There is no reason at all why this couldn't have been brought up today except that a majority in the Rules Committee said no. I mean, that is the reason why.

So what you see is frustration. What you see is frustration not just by Democrats. There are people on the Republican side who, as well, would like to see us debate comprehensive immigration reform, and instead we are blocked at every single avenue. So that has to change; otherwise, you are going to see more of the kinds of displays that you just witnessed.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a member of both the Rules Committee and the House Budget Committee.

(Mr. COLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Mr. WOODALL, for yielding me the time. I want to urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

I would be the first to tell you that this budget is not a perfect budget—no budget is actually perfect—but it is a good budget.

There are a couple of issues that do concern me, as I addressed Mr. RYAN last night; and we are worried that we haven't dealt with the wildfire issue to my satisfaction, which disrupts the appropriating process within Interior, but he assured me that he recognized that was a problem, and we are going to

continue to work on it. I actually am going to vote for Mr. WOODALL's budget when I have the opportunity to do that. It is the most conservative approach on the floor, and I appreciate that.

I think we ought to stop and remember that without PAUL RYAN, we wouldn't have the choices in front of us today. The United States Senate has chosen not to have a budget once again this year, something that it frequently does. And with all due respect to my friends who do have a budget—and I am pleased that they do—in 2010, when they were actually in the majority, they didn't present a budget to this body, either.

It is PAUL RYAN that has forced us to confront the fiscal crisis that is facing the country and has actually put something on the table to deal with it. Now, you don't have to agree with everything in it, but it has a lot of virtues to it. The first virtue is it actually focuses on the number one driver of the debt, and that is our unsustainable entitlement programs.

We have made a lot of progress in the last few years in this body on a bipartisan basis in reducing discretionary spending. We are actually spending \$165 billion less in discretionary accounts than we were in 2008 when George W. Bush was President of the United States. I don't agree with all those reductions, and I suspect my friends on the other side don't either, but that is a tangible contribution to reducing the deficit and moving us toward balance.

What we haven't dealt with, what the President has largely refused to deal with, and what I suspect my friends in their budget will not deal with, but PAUL RYAN has, are the real drivers of the debt: Medicare and Medicaid, in particular. There is an offer in there to sit down and deal seriously with Social Security, as well. And until we do those things—and PAUL RYAN has started us on a path to do them—we will never bring the budget into balance.

Now, one of the other things I like about Mr. RYAN's budget is, gosh, it really does balance within 10 years. It makes a lot of tough choices. My friend, Mr. WOODALL, actually gets there a little bit faster because he makes even tougher choices, but it balances.

My friends on the other side and the administration haven't presented a budget that balances in 10 years or 20 years or 30 years or 40 or 50—or just draw the lines right on out to infinity. I don't think that is what the American people sent us here to do. But until somebody actually has the courage to do what Mr. RYAN has done and what Mr. WOODALL has done, that is the situation the country is going to be in.

The other thing I like about the Ryan budget, in particular, is that it actually incorporates in it the agreement that he arrived at with Senator MURRAY in the other body. Now, there was a lot of criticism about that be-

cause it probably wasn't what I would have negotiated if I got my way or probably Mr. WOODALL or any other Senator, but it was a real agreement—only a 2-year agreement, but a real agreement. And against a lot of criticism, Mr. RYAN incorporated, okay, if that is going to be the settled law of the land, then that should be part of our budget. He put it in there, and I am proud of him for doing that.

Finally, again, it reduces not spending, but the growth of spending. We are going to hear a lot of talk about slashes and not investing. If you actually look at the Ryan budget, Federal spending still grows. It grows by about 3½ percent a year. The difference is the Democratic alternative—well, excuse me—the current course is like 5.2 percent. That is not a great deal of difference. We could really restrain our deficit in the short term and ultimately bring ourselves into balance not by slashing everything, but by simply making some of the simple, commonsense reforms that my friend, Mr. RYAN, to great criticism, has advanced and put on this floor year after year after year.

So I want to urge the adoption of this rule, which is a terrific rule, because despite some complaints, the reality is my friend, Mr. WOODALL, and the Rules Committee have put a variety of choices before this body.

We are going to have a budget from the Progressive Caucus that is very different than I would like, but it is going to get its opportunity. We are going to have a budget from the Congressional Black Caucus—again, different than I would choose, but it certainly deserves to be heard and examined. We are going to have Mr. WOODALL's budget. So we are going to have several choices before we get to Mr. RYAN's budget, any one of whom might win, might actually persuade people.

At the end of the day, we are going to have multiple choices because of this rule, and so it deserves to be dealt with because it does, indeed, open the process. At the end of the day, I suspect Mr. RYAN's budget will be the one that passes. Again, I am very proud to do that, and I urge its passage.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman RYAN for again putting together yet another budget that balances in ten years. I know from the many meetings that we had on this side of the aisle that there was a lot of thought put into how we can maintain our commitment to fiscal balance, given the mounting debt, and the overall deterioration of our economic growth, brought about, in part, by the over 17 trillion debt.

Additionally, this budget maintains the Republican focus on dealing with the true drivers of our debt, entitlement programs. It would have been very easy, given that the Bipartisan Budget Act set the 302(a) allocations for Fiscal Year 2015, to not do a budget; however, this budget, this blueprint yet again allows us to share our vision for the future.

This budget reflects the discretionary caps which were agreed to in the Bipartisan Budget

Act. As a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I have seen the devastating cuts in end strength and capabilities we will face if we continue with sequester. And, instead of making discretionary cuts for the fifth year in a row, we have redoubled our efforts in entitlement programs to ensure they are available for all in the future.

I was disappointed to see that the President reversed himself in his budget submission, removing Chained CPI from his budget proposal. However, House Republicans are willing to work with the President where possible and find common ground that will move our debt trajectory downward, instead of increasing at an exponential rate.

Many have criticized this budget for "moving the goalposts" and now transitioning to a Premium Support model for those 56 and below; however, Madam Speaker, we have to face the facts. Every year that we do not act it becomes harder and harder to preserve the current programs for those already at or near retirement. This budget recognizes that hard reality and adjusts itself accordingly.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I want to say a little about wildfires suppression costs. When devastating wildfires do occur and the costs exceed the Forest Service's budget, most often, other programs within the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee bear the costs. And that is not right. I am disappointed that this budget fails to consider how we can better budget for the true costs of wildfire suppression activities. My friend from Idaho, Mr. SIMPSON, has a deficit-neutral bill that would deal with this issue. Much of what we have considered on the floor the past few days has aimed at ensuring the true costs of programs are reflected in the budget. That is what Mr. SIMPSON's bill does and I hope we can consider it in the coming weeks.

I hope this budget serves as a wake-up call that it is time to act. Here in Washington, we can become numbed to the problems facing our country. But they are real, and they must be addressed. This budget reflects the Republican vision for the future, one where we are in control of our destiny, as opposed to turning over control to our creditors.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to agree with my friend from Oklahoma that Mr. RYAN has given us a choice. He has presented us a budget that would end Medicare as we know it; it would slash the social safety net to smithereens; it cuts SNAP by \$137 billion; and it would damage the National Institutes of Health and transportation funding. Pell grants would be cut. I could go right down the list. Yeah, I know we have got a choice here, and people ought to understand what that budget is all about.

My friends on the other side may be proud of this. Again, I find that puzzling, because the notion that the only way to balance the budget is by hurting poor people or hurting the middle class, I don't agree with.

You talk about sacrifices. Why are all the sacrifices on the backs of middle-income families or on the backs of the poor in this country? The rich get a tax cut. The rich get a tax cut. Middle class families get a tax increase. Poor people get their food stamps taken away from them. Why is that al-

ways the choice that you provide Members of this House? Why are those the only people that sacrifice? I just find it unconscionable, quite frankly.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio).

Mr. DEFazio. Madam Speaker, let's talk about what is not in the Ryan budget.

The Federal highway trust fund, which funds all highway, road, bridge, and transit projects in the United States of America will be exhausted sometime this summer. A number of States are already delaying or canceling major projects, and there will be a flood of States doing that after the trust fund goes belly up.

For next year, under the Ryan budget, there will be zero—no, none, zero—Federal investment in roads, bridges, highways, and transit despite the deteriorated state of our infrastructure for somewhere between 9 and 11 months until we pay our past bills, and then there will be a little trickle.

Meanwhile, bridges will be falling down, people will be driving through potholes, delays, and congestion. We will walk away from or lose over 1 million construction, manufacturing, and engineering jobs, and it will have an impact on hundreds of thousands—millions—of other jobs across the United States of America, not even to begin to talk about our lack of competitiveness with the rest of the world.

□ 1315

The Ryan budget does address this in a rather novel way, so the trust fund is going broke. Probably what we have done the last couple of times when we get to that point, we say transportation is so important we transferred some general fund money over. The Ryan budget says you can't transfer general fund money over to transportation; it must go broke.

Well, the other thing is a new source of revenue or user fees. The Federal gas tax is 18.4 cents a gallon, and that has been since 1993, the same tax in 1993 when gas was \$1.11 a gal. Last weekend, I paid \$3.71, and Federal tax is still 18.4 cents a gallon.

Where is that money going? It is going to ExxonMobil; it is going to Wall Street speculators. It sure is the heck not going to rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure and putting millions of Americans back to work.

Under the Ryan budget, we are going to revolve Federal transportation. What does that mean? It means we are going to have a 50-State and territory Federal transportation policy. You know, we actually tried that once. This was 1956. This is the brandnew Kansas Turnpike.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. DEFazio. Oklahoma promised they would build one, too. Well, they didn't have the money. They said: sorry, guys, can't build it.

This is Emil Schweitzer's farm field. For 3 years, people crashed through the barrier at the end here and went into his field, until Dwight David Eisenhower, a Republican, passed the national highway transportation bill with a trust fund.

That would be undone by PAUL RYAN. He says States can opt out. They don't even have to collect the 18.4 cents Federal tax; they can do whatever they want with that money.

Madam Speaker, counties are actually ripping up paved roads and turning them back to gravel because they can't afford them. There are 140,000 bridges that need repair or replacement. Forty percent of the national highway system has pavement that has totally failed.

There is a \$70 billion backlog on our transit systems. These are millions of jobs foregone—productivity foregone, and if you are so darn proud, as I heard on that side, why aren't you proud of the future of America, putting people back to work and competing with the rest of the world with a world class, 21st century transportation system? You're going to kill it.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT), a former sheriff, a member of the class of 2010, and a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, one of the most important things that we do in this Congress—and it is a constitutional requirement—is we provide for the common defense of this Nation, to allow things like my good friends on the Democrat side are arguing for in regards to more entitlement programs, more helping our neighbors; but without a national defense, all of this is moot. It doesn't matter. It adds up to nothing if we can't defend the homeland and defend our friends when they need it.

Now, I will tell you that this budget does something that is needed. It increases the spending for our military. It actually takes something that the President, the Commander in Chief who has cut the military by \$1 trillion in the last few years, is actually restoring money that he was holding hostage.

He said the military can have \$26 billion more if you give us \$27 billion more for domestic spending. It is about holding our safety hostage. When those that are in a position to talk to us and tell us that the world is changing, you don't have to look very far.

See what is going on in Russia and China and Iran and North Korea. This is not a safer world since this President has taken office. It has become a much more dangerous world, particularly from state actors.

It is not all his fault, I must say, Madam Speaker. This goes back to years of kicking the can down the road by this Congress.

Mr. WOODALL and I came to Congress at the same time, 3 years ago, Madam

Speaker. We weren't part of the problem, but those who were here prior to that have been part of the problem. They continued to kick the can down the road.

PAUL RYAN, chairman of the Budget Committee, and members of the Budget Committee actually took the bull by the horns. It is starting to turn this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. NUGENT. This is actually talking about difficult questions we have to talk about.

This body loves, if the problem isn't immediate, we don't have to worry about it, don't worry about it because it will never happen; but we are being told by professionals: guess what, Medicare and Social Security are at risk if we do nothing.

If we don't challenge the status quo, if we don't start talking about how do we move forward to protect our seniors today from cuts in Medicare and Social Security, how we move forward for our younger folks as they get closer to retirement age, we have to do more, and I believe this budget is creating a dialogue for us to move forward and do more, not just put our heads in the sand and say we just need to spend more money because we can tax our way out of it. Everybody knows that is not true.

Madam Speaker, the first and most important job of our government is to provide for the defense of its citizens.

If the government can't protect the people's liberty then everything else we talk about today—every dime spent on every domestic program—is all moot.

So when we're considering how taxpayer money should be spent, we ought to keep this at the forefront of our minds.

We ought to put forward a budget that recognizes this basic truth and most fundamental responsibility.

I'm glad to see that Chairman RYAN's budget embraces this fundamental priority because, Madam Speaker, not all the budgets we'll debate today share this perspective.

Not even the budget of the military's own Commander in Chief.

The House Armed Services Committee has analyzed the last several budget proposals from President Obama, and I want to share some of those findings with my colleagues in the larger House of Representatives today:

Since entering the White House, President Obama has proposed more than \$1 trillion in cuts to the military.

Over the next 10 years, the President is proposing \$345 billion less than the minimum amount the military says they need to perform the President's own defense strategy.

Less than 15 percent of our U.S. Army is deployment ready today.

Without regard for the command signals from Combatant Commanders, the President has produced a budget recommendation that neither complies with the statutory nor strategic requirements of the military.

Instead, the President cuts \$26 billion from the military and holds it for ransom until this

Congress is willing to give him \$32 billion in domestic programs.

These budget gimmicks will not stand and I applaud the House Budget Committee for not engaging in the false narrative that this Congress must pay \$58 billion in order to restore \$26 billion to meet the minimum standard of national security.

In this tough fiscal environment, the budget brought to the Floor by this Rule provides the minimum dollars necessary to resource the President's strategy and sustain the World's premiere fighting force.

In fiscal year 2015, that means a commitment of this Congress to our military of more than \$521 billion.

Translating that dollar amount into capability—this budget maintains a force structure well above the drastic reductions recommended by the President:

The Army has the flexibility to retain the 100,000 soldiers on the chopping block.

Navy can preserve the 11 aircraft carriers required by both strategy and law,

Modernization programs critical to maintaining our military's technological edge and our troops' safety will continue to give our warfighters an advantage on the battlefield next year and beyond.

I truly hope the Army will take the flexibility afforded them under this budget as an opportunity to establish the right balance between Active Component, Reserve Component and the National Guard.

By the time this budget goes into effect, our Army will be drawing down from 14 years of continuous war.

To effectively make that transition

To reduce the cost of a war-time standing Army while preserving capability

To "right-size" the forward deployed force and meet the domestic responsibilities to the individual states

Big Army must recognize and incorporate the National Guard's indispensable role in providing our national security at home and abroad.

If such a right-sizing cannot be found internally within the Army, this Congress will have to put Army decisions on hold until a commission can be established to study the correct balance of the Service moving forward.

Finally, I applaud this budget for sustaining compensation for all warfighters, retirees and their families.

Too many times over the past several years, Congress has had to defend the pay of service members—as if the reasons for adequately compensating our all-volunteer military were not self-evident.

I hope that this year, the paycheck of our troops will be spared the political games of the recent history.

We are certainly off to a good start with this budget that meets our compensation commitments to the military—including healthcare.

And so, Madam Speaker, I support this rule and the underlining resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman from Florida that national defense includes more than the number of weapons we have in our arsenal. It also include the quality of life for our people here at home, and these programs that he is denigrating, like SNAP, for example, I should remind him there are an extremely high number of military fami-

lies that rely on SNAP to get by and a high number of veterans who do as well.

Basic food, they are looking for helping with putting food on the table. So before anybody denigrates those programs, understand that they contribute to our national defense as well. They are feeding our military families and veterans because our returning veterans can't find jobs that pay a livable wage.

At this time, it is my pleasure to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. MCGOVERN.

Madam Speaker, this is pretty exciting this morning. I think this is the first time in 5 years that I have been here that we were actually having a debate, discussing what both sides stand for.

Mr. DEFAZIO was wonderful. He is absolutely right. He knows what he is talking about. We haven't built infrastructure. Do you know, we haven't built one airport from the ground up in the United States since 1972, and every place else in the rest of the world has brandnew airports?

They are all whizzing about on high-speed rail. We don't have any; but we spent \$2 billion a week while we were in Iraq. We were willing to spend that, maimed 46,000 young people, killed thousands of them as well, as well as people in those countries—for oil.

What we really do hear this morning and what pleases me so much is we are really showing the difference in this country and what the two sides believe in. We don't believe over here that the richest people should get richer. We don't believe that we need a budget right now that lowers the corporate tax rate.

We believe that all Americans should be paying their fair share, so we can build back up, and maybe we can start to enjoy some of the things that are happening elsewhere in the 21st century.

This budget is a misguided proposal driven by flawed math. At worst, it is a cynical choice to balance our budget on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans in order to protect the incomes of powerful special interests and the wealthiest few, and it does precisely that.

It is not news to anybody in the country that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer and the unemployed are desperate. Everybody knows that. The issue is: What is the Congress of the United States going to do about that?

Now, with this proposal, the majority gives an average tax cut of \$200,000 to families earning more than \$1 million a year, so they are okay. They earn \$1 million a year, and they are going to get \$200,000; but to pay for it, we have to raise taxes on the middle class.

Let me tell you how we do that. With this proposal, they defend the tax loophole that we have been trying to close

ever since I have been in Congress, the money we give oil companies so they will drill.

The five major oil companies, we pay them \$4 billion a year so they will drill; like they weren't having the biggest profits on the face of the Earth and no one needs to encourage them to drill, but we pay for that, and to do that, they are going to turn Medicare into a voucher program.

We have discussed this before. That means your aged parents and grandparents will go into a marketplace by themselves—or maybe you can go with them—and look for their own insurance policy.

They will be given a government voucher or a stipend or whatever they want to call it to help pay for it, but it may not cover the cost, so the rest of the cost will come from the senior citizen. It will take exactly away what Lyndon Johnson had in mind in 1968. The benefit guaranteed by Medicare will be gone.

To pay for that, again, they want to keep the Medicare plan we have today, and with this proposal, the majority reduces the tax rate paid by corporations. I have said that before, and I want to say it again. Corporation tax rates are reduced, and we already know that most of them put all of their assets in the Cayman Islands or in some other country and pay no taxes whatsoever.

If we just brought some of the tax money back from the Cayman Islands, I bet we could have high-speed rail in the United States. Wouldn't that be wonderful?

So they take \$137 billion in nutrition assistance, the food people live on, out of the mouths of low-income families struggling to get by. The author of this budget said such draconian cuts are necessary because:

We don't want to turn the safety net into a hammock that lulls able-bodied people to lives of dependency and complacency.

If that is his goal, then he and his colleagues have written a budget that badly misses the mark. For the hammock of dependency isn't found in the homes of working Americans, but on the beaches of the Cayman Islands, where powerful special interest and the wealthiest few depend upon policies like this budget to build their own hammock out of the social safety net that used to support the largest middle class on Earth that is fast disappearing.

For more than three decades, the wealthy and the powerful have used money and influence to secure tax cuts, to deregulate industries, and to pass free trade deals that put corporate profits before America's jobs.

In so doing, they have redirected revenue away from the Federal Government and made it virtually impossible to fund the programs that have made our Nation the envy of the world.

With the wealthy and powerful exempted from paying their fair share, our Nation put tens of billions of dol-

lars and two wars on the Nation's credit card and failed to invest in maintaining our roads, modernizing our airports, or building efficient passenger rail here at home.

As a result, highway bridges are literally falling into the water, our airports have become laughably out of date, and our trains travel at speeds half as fast as those found in Germany, China, and Japan.

Far from solving this crisis, the majority's budget doubles down on the failed policies by reducing taxing for the rich and powerful even further. We have already said a millionaire gets a \$200,000 tax cut, so we are going to ask the most vulnerable Americans to pay the price.

Under this budget, 170,000 children will lose Head Start, and 29,000 teachers and aides will be left without jobs. College students, who are already suffering under staggering costs of higher education, would be told that they must repay their loans while they are still in school.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. And \$205 billion would be cut from programs like Pell grants, making it harder than ever to get the education that is needed to succeed in the modern world.

Perhaps, most egregiously, the promise of secure and affordable health care would be broken with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act and the end of the Medicare guarantee. Under the majority's budget, Medicare would be turned into a voucher, as I said before.

On Sunday, the news program "60 Minutes" traveled down the winding roads of the Cumberland Mountains into the heart of Appalachia in a RV called the Health Wagon. The aging vehicle is the only source of health care for thousands of Americans in desperate need of medical attention.

The vehicle is staffed by two incredible nurses and other medical volunteers, including Dr. Joe Smiddy, the Health Wagon's volunteer medical director. After completing medical school, Dr. Smiddy had to enroll in truck driver school so he could drive the Health Wagon's x-ray lab, an 18-wheel truck that provides insight into diseases that were going undiagnosed.

These volunteers have seen the price individual Americans pay when the Chamber puts the priorities of the rich and the powerful ahead of everyone else. Dr. Smiddy said of life in the Cumberland Mountains:

This is a Third World country of diabetes, hypertension, lung cancer, and COPD in the United States.

Madam Speaker, a Third World country.

Though the work of the Health Wagon does every day is heroic, no individual living in the wealthiest Nation on Earth should be relying upon the good will of volunteers to receive modern medical care.

Doctors and nurses of the Health Wagon should not be relying on Federal grants.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

□ 1330

Ms. SLAUGHTER. That is why we say this budget is not a reflection of our values, but theirs.

It is through the budget we decide whether we protect tax loopholes for Big Oil or provide our fellow citizens with access to secure and affordable health care, an education, a job, and a place to live. It is through our budget we decide whether kids can go to college or not.

Only by choosing to act and asking every American, including corporations, to pay their fair share—corporations are people, I understand, we have established that in the Supreme Court—we will be able to put every American on a path to prosperity and restore our role as the most advanced nation in the world.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the secretary of the Republican Conference.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding. I also thank Chairman RYAN and his staff for their hard work in producing this budget. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

Madam Speaker, budget puts a numerical value on the priorities we claim to value, and as such, it is a moral document. This budget will protect and strengthen Medicare, preserve our commitment to veterans, and keep faith with future generations by getting spending under control and fostering economic growth.

This budget controls spending by ending sweetheart deals for favored corporations and returning government to its proper limits. Years of overreach and cronyism have weakened confidence in the Federal Government and damaged our economy.

As Chairman RYAN mentioned in his Rules Committee testimony last night, the CBO has warned that, if we fail to address our lackluster economic growth and rising debt, our children and grandchildren are guaranteed a lower standard of living than what we currently enjoy.

For the first time in American history, we may bequeath to our children and grandchildren a less prosperous country with limited opportunities to pursue their American Dream. As a mother and grandmother, I will do all I can to keep that from happening.

Over the next decade, the U.S. Government will spend \$5.8 trillion servicing debt—\$5 trillion, Madam Speaker—simply to make interest payments to our creditors.

Those dollars could be put to work at home strengthening our military, caring for our veterans, and improving the lives of all Americans; but instead, nearly half of it will go to pay for the inability of those who came before to manage the Nation's Treasury responsibly. We need to stop spending money we don't have.

Unlike the President's budget, this budget actually balances within the budget window. A balanced budget will foster a healthier economy and help create jobs. By reducing the capital the government takes out of the private sector, this budget will foster opportunity.

This budget would keep our children and grandchildren from inheriting an insurmountable debt. If we take action now, we can pass on an America that is free, prosperous, and filled with opportunity.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question.

Defeat of the previous question will allow us to amend the rule to provide for consideration of the Paycheck Fairness Act, an act that addresses the persistent problem of unequal pay in our economy, and would help make the bill before us a real boon for women and their families.

Women are now half of the Nation's workforce and two-thirds of primary or cobreadwinners. The sad fact is they are still only making and being paid 77 cents on the dollar on average compared to men. This holds true across all occupations and education levels. For women of color, the disparities are even worse.

Less pay for women means less pay for an entire family at a time when millions are struggling to enter the middle class. Give their kids a chance at a better life, achieve the American Dream. It affects all of us.

We have seen the Republican budget that is being discussed today already does so much to put that dream out of reach for America's families. It slashes our social safety net, cuts off nutrition support, and denies food to millions of low-income Americans, and our most important anti-hunger program in the Nation.

The Center for Budget and Policy Priorities said 69 percent of the cuts in this Republican budget would come from programs serving low- and moderate-income people.

Let's be in opposition to this previous question because we will have an opportunity to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question because when women succeed, America succeeds. Let's help hardworking families take home the pay that they deserve and ensure that women are being paid the same as men for the same job.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I advise my friend from Massachusetts that we have no further speakers remaining, if he is prepared to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a report by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities entitled "Ryan Budget Would Slash SNAP by \$137 Billion Over 10 Years, Low-Income Households in all States Would Feel Sharp Effects."

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question and to vote "no" on the underlying bill.

The Ryan budget will create a government without a conscience. It is cruel. This budget is a rotten thing to do to poor people; it is a rotten thing to do to the middle class. It is an outrage.

So please, again, vote "no" on the previous question, and vote "no" on the underlying bill.

This really is an embarrassment. We could do so much better in this Chamber. The people in this country deserve much better than what we are giving them.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

[From the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Apr. 4, 2014]

RYAN BUDGET WOULD SLASH SNAP BY \$137 BILLION OVER TEN YEARS
LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS IN ALL STATES WOULD FEEL SHARP EFFECTS
(By Dorothy Rosenbaum)

House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan's budget plan includes cuts in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), formerly known as the Food Stamp Program) of \$137 billion—18 percent—over the next ten years (2015-2024), which would necessitate ending food assistance for millions of low-income families, cutting benefits for millions of such households, or some combination of the two. Chairman Ryan proposed similarly deep SNAP cuts in each of his last three budgets. The new Ryan budget specifies two categories of SNAP cuts:

It includes every major benefit cut in a House-passed version of the recent farm bill that Congress ultimately rejected when enacting the final farm bill. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has estimated the House cuts, which amount to \$12 billion over the 2015-2018 period, would have terminated benefits to 3.8 million low-income people in 2014. After a difficult two-year process, Congress just two months ago, on a bipartisan basis, passed a farm bill that rejected these House cuts and reauthorized SNAP and other Agriculture programs for five years.

It would convert SNAP into a block grant beginning in 2019 and cut funding steeply—by

\$125 billion (or almost 30 percent) over 2019 to 2024. States would be left to decide whose benefits to reduce or terminate. They would have no good choices—the program already provides an average of only \$1.40 per person per meal, primarily to poor children, working-poor parents, seniors, people with disabilities, and others struggling to make ends meet.

RYAN BLOCK GRANT WOULD FORCE STATES TO CUT FOOD ASSISTANCE DEEPLY

Since 90 percent of SNAP spending goes for food assistance, and most of the rest covers state administrative costs to determine program eligibility and operate SNAP properly, policymakers couldn't achieve cuts of this magnitude without substantially scaling back eligibility or reducing benefits deeply, with serious effects on low-income families and individuals. Table 1 provides state-by-state estimates of the potential impact of the block grant proposal.

Cuts in eligibility. If the cuts came solely from eliminating eligibility for categories of currently eligible households or individuals, states would have to cut an average of 10 million people from the program (relative to SNAP enrollment without the cuts) each year between 2019 and 2024.

Cuts in benefits. If the cuts came solely from across-the-board benefit cuts, states would have to cut more than \$40 per person per month in 2019 to 2024 (in nominal dollars), on average. This would require setting the maximum benefit at about 77 percent of the Thrifty Food Plan, the Agriculture Department's (USDA) estimate of the cost of a bare-bones, nutritionally adequate diet. (Under SNAP rules, the maximum benefit—which goes to households with no disposable income after deductions for certain necessities—is set at 100 percent of the cost of the Thrifty Food Plan.)

The impact of such a change would be pronounced. All families of four—including the poorest—would face benefit cuts of about \$160 a month in fiscal year 2019, or more than \$1,900 per year. All families of three would face cuts of about \$125 per month, or about \$1,500 per year. Of course, policymakers could shield some households from such deep cuts, but then other households would need to bear even larger cuts in order to produce the \$125 billion in block-grant savings.

While states might not seek to hit the Ryan targets through eligibility cuts or benefit cuts alone, these examples illustrate the magnitude of the reductions needed. States would have few other places to achieve the required cuts; as noted, about 90 percent of SNAP expenditures are for food assistance.

PROPOSED CUTS REST ON INACCURATE CLAIMS

Chairman Ryan bases his proposed SNAP cuts on a series of inaccurate claims about SNAP program growth, work disincentives, and waste, fraud, and abuse.

Spending growth. Chairman Ryan justifies deep SNAP cuts in part by claiming that the "explosive growth [of SNAP and other low-income programs] is threatening the overall strength of the safety net" and "SNAP spending is forecast to be permanently higher than previous estimates even after the recession is long past." While SNAP spending did grow substantially during the recession, it has begun to decline as a share of the economy and is expected to continue shrinking over the coming decade.

SNAP grew because of three factors: the depth of the recent recession, which made more people eligible; improvements in reaching eligible households (particularly working-poor families); and the 2009 Recovery Act's temporary benefit boost (which ended in November 2013). As Figure 1 indicates, CBO projects that SNAP will return to pre-recession levels as a share of the economy

(gross domestic product) once the economy fully recovers. The program does not contribute to the nation's long-term budget problem because it is projected to grow no faster than the economy over time.

Work and dependency. Chairman Ryan also justifies cutting SNAP and turning it over to the states by implying that SNAP doesn't encourage recipients to work. Yet the number of SNAP recipients who work while receiving SNAP has more than tripled over the past decade. Furthermore, CBPP analysis finds that the large majority of SNAP recipients who can work do so, and many more rely on SNAP when they are between jobs or looking for work.

Among SNAP households with at least one working-age, non-disabled adult, more than half work while receiving SNAP and more than 80 percent work in the year prior to or the year after receiving SNAP. The rates are even higher for families with children: more than 60 percent work while receiving SNAP, and almost 90 percent work in the prior or subsequent year. Only 4 percent of households that worked in the year before receiving SNAP did not work the following year.

Moreover, SNAP already has work requirements. Adults without children face a harsh three-month time limit if they are unemployed and not participating in a qualifying employment and training program. States can apply for a waiver from this requirement during a weak economy when jobs are not available by submitting detailed Department of Labor data showing high unemployment in local areas or statewide, but the number of areas qualifying for a waiver is falling as the economy recovers, and CBO expects the number of such areas to shrink markedly over the next few years. (The Ryan budget would eliminate these waivers immediately, even for areas with double-digit unemployment.) In addition, states have broad authority to operate employment and training programs, and the recent farm bill includes a major demonstration program for states to test innovative approaches to providing employment and training services that raise recipients' earnings and reduce their reliance on public assistance.

Waste, fraud, and abuse. Finally, Chairman Ryan justifies his SNAP proposals based on charges that SNAP is rife with waste, fraud, and abuse. The reality is that SNAP has one of the most rigorous quality control systems of any public benefit program and a very low error rate. Despite the recent growth in caseloads, the share of total SNAP payments that represent overpayments or payments to ineligible households fell to a record low of 2.77 percent in fiscal year 2012. In addition, USDA has cut "trafficking"—the sale of SNAP benefits for cash, which violates federal law—by three-quarters over the past 15 years. Only 1.3 percent of SNAP benefits are trafficked. USDA has also permanently disqualified thousands of retail stores from the program for not following strict federal requirements. When cases of SNAP fraud are reported in the news, it is because the offenders have been caught, evidence that states and USDA are aggressively combating fraud.

BENEFIT CUTS WOULD PRIMARILY AFFECT LOW-INCOME FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN, SENIORS, AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

The Ryan budget documents assert that Congress could achieve the required savings by capping federal SNAP funding and "allow[ing] states to customize SNAP to the needs of their citizens" through a block grant. That description leaves the mistaken impression that the program is not serving a population that is overwhelmingly poor and that savings could be achieved without significantly harming millions of vulnerable Americans.

Unlike most means-tested benefit programs, which are restricted to particular categories of low-income individuals, SNAP is broadly available to almost all households with very low incomes. Cutting SNAP thus would affect broad swaths of the low-income population. Currently, 46.8 million people receive SNAP to help them feed their families. Census data show that in 2012 (the latest year for which these data are available), 46.5 million Americans lived below the poverty line, and 64.8 million lived below 130 percent of the poverty line, SNAP's gross income limit.

The overwhelming majority of SNAP households are families with children, seniors, or people with disabilities. Seventy percent of SNAP participants are in families with children; more than one-quarter are in households that include senior citizens or people with disabilities.

SNAP households have very low incomes. Eighty-three percent of SNAP households have incomes below the poverty line while they are receiving SNAP assistance (about \$19,800 for a family of three in 2014). Such households receive 91 percent of SNAP benefits. Two of every five SNAP households have incomes below half of the poverty line. Such individuals and families have little flexibility in their monthly budgets to cope with deep reductions in food assistance.

Low-wage workers rely on SNAP to boost their monthly income. Millions of Americans live in working households with earnings that are not sufficient to meet basic needs. In 2012, some 39 million people (1 in 8 Americans) lived in a working family with cash income below 130 percent of the poverty line. Low incomes like these—which typically reflect low wages or limited work hours—can leave families unable to afford necessities like food and housing on a regular basis. SNAP benefits play a crucial role in boosting such families' monthly resources: in 2012, a typical working mother with two children on SNAP earned \$1,148 per month (\$13,700 on an annual basis) and received \$307 per month in SNAP benefits. If the Ryan proposal had been in place in 2012 and was implemented via across-the-board cuts, this family's monthly benefits would have been cut by \$110 per month—or about 36 percent.

SNAP BENEFIT CUTS WOULD INCREASE HUNGER AND POVERTY

SNAP cuts of the magnitude that the Ryan budget proposes would almost certainly lead to increases in hunger and poverty. Emergency food providers report that more people ask for help in the latter half of the month, after their SNAP benefits run out. Under the Ryan budget's steep funding cuts, a typical household's SNAP benefits would run out many days earlier, placing greater strain on household finances (and on emergency food providers) and significantly increasing the risk of hunger.

Deep SNAP cuts also would cause more families and individuals to fall into poverty and push poor families deeper into poverty. Currently, SNAP helps lessen the extent and severity of poverty; Census Bureau data on disposable family income that include the value of SNAP and other non-cash benefits and taxes show that:

SNAP lifted 4.9 million Americans above the poverty line in 2012, including 2.2 million children.

SNAP kept more children—1.4 million—from falling below half of the poverty line in 2012, more than any other program.

The Ryan SNAP cuts would thus have a sharp, adverse effect on millions of the lowest-income Americans. Moreover, they would not occur in isolation. The Ryan budget contains steep cuts in other low-income assistance programs, compounding the effects of

the SNAP cuts. Many vulnerable families would lose health coverage, housing assistance, and other important supports such as child care at the same time they faced SNAP cuts.

CUTS COULD BE EVEN LARGER UNDER A BLOCK GRANT

Block-granting SNAP, as Chairman Ryan proposes, would eliminate its ability to respond automatically to the increased need that results from rising poverty and unemployment during economic downturns. Annual federal funding would remain fixed, regardless of whether the economy was in a recession or how severe a downturn was. As a result, the House Budget Committee staff's estimate that the Ryan plan would cut SNAP by \$137 billion over ten years may understate the magnitude of the cut—the cuts would be still more severe if the economy performs less well over the coming decade than CBO projects.

If a SNAP block grant had been in effect in 2013 at funding levels set in 2007, before the recession, federal funding in 2013 would have been about 50 percent below actual funding that year (excluding the Recovery Act benefit boost).

Furthermore, under a block grant, SNAP would not be able to respond to natural disasters. Hurricane Sandy victims in New York and New Jersey obtained temporary food aid through SNAP in 2013, as did victims of disasters in five other states.

Also, under a block grant, many states would likely shift funds away from food assistance to other purposes when they faced large state budget shortfalls. SNAP includes several non-food components, such as job training and related child care; a block grant structure would enable states to divert funds away from food to these purposes and withdraw state funds currently spent on these services.

Finally, because of its capped funding structure, a block grant like the one Chairman Ryan proposes would reverse the recent progress made, on a bipartisan basis, to improve SNAP participation among eligible low-income households. Viewing SNAP as an important work support and health and nutrition benefit, the last three Administrations, as well as governors from across the political spectrum, have sought to boost participation rates—especially among working-poor families and low-income elderly people, the two groups with the lowest participation rates. Overall, the efforts have paid off. SNAP reached 79 percent of all eligible individuals in a typical month in 2011 (the most recent year for which these data are available), a significant improvement from 2002, when the participation rate bottomed out at 54 percent. Participation among eligible low-income working families rose from 43 percent in 2002 to about 67 percent in 2011. For the elderly, it improved more modestly—from 26 percent in 2002 to about 39 percent in 2011.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You couldn't tell it from the acrimony that has been expressed over the last hour, but this is a good day. There are so many opportunities we have to come to this House and be disappointed with the bills that are here before us.

Why? Because we have different ideas, we have different ideas. My constituency, different from the constituencies of so many of my other colleagues, I don't question that they do their best to serve their constituencies, but in serving their voters, they harm mine and sometimes vice versa.

Today, that is not the question. We don't have a choice between the lesser of two evils. We don't have a choice against my way or their way. We have a rule that allows for absolutely every Member of this Congress to write their own budget. Think about that, Madam Speaker. We are talking about the budget of the United States of America, \$3.5 trillion.

Now, everybody doesn't write their own budget. It turns out we have more in common than we have that divides us around this institution, Madam Speaker. We have six budgets that we are going to be voting on.

That is every single budget that was submitted, but it is only six budgets. One came out of the House Budget Committee, one came out of the Republican Study Committee, one came out of the Congressional Black Caucus, one came from the Progressive Caucus, one came from the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and one came from Mr. MULVANEY representing the President's budget.

By golly, Madam Speaker, if you can't find something that you believe in, in that continuum of budgets, you are not looking hard enough.

Here is the thing: budgets are about choices; budgets are about priorities. The budgets of previous Congresses and previous Presidents have run up a debt the size of which servicing, even at these lowest teaser interest rates in American history, will suck out 18 months of productivity over the next 10 years.

I do not question my friend's commitment to the SNAP program, but understand that decisions of the past, paying the interest alone, require the SNAP program be closed completely for 18 months.

I do not question my friend's commitment to national security, but the budgets and the priorities of past Congresses have borrowed us into such a state that paying interest alone would require us to close our military for 18 months over the next 10 years.

We could not agree more that this budget week is about choices and priorities, and I tell you the choices and priorities of past Congresses and past Presidents are trading away hope for the next generation of Americans. They are trading away opportunities to serve Americans who need to be served today.

They are trading away security that folks should be able to have in a land as great as America; but because of decisions that this body, the Senate, and the White House have made over the past decades, that security is no more.

Not the budget-passed budget, Madam Speaker, the Budget Committee budget brings us to balance. We will begin to pay down that debt. We will reclaim those opportunities for those future generations.

Don't we owe it to them, Madam Speaker, not to advance ourselves at their expense? I think I know what the answer to that question is. We are

going to be debating it over the next 3 days here on the House floor, and I hope my colleagues will agree with me, at the end of that process, that we owe it to them to do better today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, this budget is not about reducing deficit or establishing a regime of fiscal responsibility. This is a budget to dismantle the national safety net system and to transfer those savings to the wealthiest individuals and corporations. Even the Appropriations Chairman, Chairman HAL ROGERS, thinks that this budget is "Draconian."

If you want a perfect example of Republican ideology and book cooking, look no further than H.R. 1874, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2013.

Republicans want to force the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to use their discredited models to help them mask the true effect of their slash and burn agenda, while at the same time, denying the use of their pseudo-math to the one committee where it would hurt them, the Appropriations Committee. They want to pretend all day long that the discredited "tax-cuts = revenue growth" model will do wonders for America, while denying the fact that the economically proven model of "investment = growth" will bring the much needed prosperity and equality that our citizens desperately want and need.

Defense spending is certainly important, but this budget is a complete failure of imagination when it comes to defending this country. Defense is not simply about bullets, bombs and brigades. We also defend this country militarily and economically through making sure we have an educated citizenry. At the very least, please tell me that you understand that our war materiel is the most sophisticated in the world. Please tell me that you understand that we, at the very least, need educated men and women to operate this equipment. Well, this education does not miraculously appear overnight. Indeed, their journey to where they are today started many years ago. And sure, some of them did not come from wealthy families and yes, some of our men and women in uniform had to rely on federal programs like Head Start, but that is never anything to be ashamed of and is certainly not something we should now turn our backs on. To defend a country as large and complex as ours is a multifaceted endeavor, an endeavor this budget utterly fails to meet.

Can "general welfare," a constitutional obligation of Congress, be defined as a budget that places the heaviest burden on the vast majority of Americans, while bestowing the greatest benefits on the wealthiest?

What is the appropriate level of shared sacrifice that ought to be required? One percent of Americans take home over one quarter of all income every year, and have seen those incomes rise 18 percent in the last decade. But those in the middle have seen their incomes fall. Why do you think that those who have suffered most severely under this recession should bear the greatest burden of hardship? What does this budget do to help those people, as opposed to the wealthy who will be fine no matter what we do with this budget?

In your budget you say, "The first job of the federal government is securing the safety and liberty of its citizens from threats at home and abroad." Why is the only threat to the American Dream that the Republicans deem worthy

of funding the one that comes from abroad? While this budget increases defense spending above pre-sequester levels over the next decade, it ignores the very real threat to the American dream at home, by increasing inequality, and removing any hope for struggling families to move up to or stay in the middle class.

How will deep spending cuts in service-oriented Federal programs help citizens weather the economic crisis? How will huge tax breaks for the wealthiest enable the poor and middle class to obtain jobs? With individual income and payroll taxes comprising 82 percent of revenue resources, and corporate taxes making up only 9 percent, how does this budget anticipate growing the economy when the burden falls disproportionately on those who need the most help right now?

Which specific tax provisions will you target in order to make the "broadening" savings claimed in this budget? The biggest four are (1) the home mortgage interest deduction, (2) the exclusion of employer-provided health benefits, (3) charitable deductions, and (4) state and local tax deductions. What specific tax loopholes do you propose to close?

Where, specifically, does all the projected revenue come from? This budget cuts the top marginal income tax rate to 25 percent, the lowest the rate has been since Herbert Hoover. Yet the budget also predicts that federal tax revenues will increase by nearly \$600 billion by 2021. President Reagan used a similar model which has since been discredited as unworkable, and which, on his watch, drastically increased the deficit and national debt.

How will Americans receive the health care they need if their Medicare premium and out-of-pocket costs become unaffordable under this proposed privatized system? Is the value of the vouchers linked to health care cost growth?

Americans already pay more than twice as much per persons for health care as other wealthy countries with the same or longer life expectancies.

Since the government pays for about half of this country's health care, almost all of which is actually provided by the private sector, future health care costs are increasing because of private sector costs, not the government.

Is it your contention that eliminating government support will suddenly render health care affordable? Or does this budget foresee the government washing its hands of the need to ensure quality health care for its citizens?

How does converting Medicaid into a block grant bear relation to the actual need for Medicaid services? When two-thirds of participants are seniors and persons with disabilities, when half of long-term care is covered by Medicaid, and when 70 percent of people over the age of 65 will require long-term care services at some point, how will cutting \$732 billion benefit these Americans?

Is the goal to control costs or to shift costs? The CBO says that privatizing Medicare will shift costs onto seniors. In 2030, traditional Medicare costs would be less than the private costs envisioned by the GOP budget. Under this plan seniors will be out of pocket for about two-thirds the cost of privatized care, as opposed to about one-quarter under traditional Medicare.

Isn't it true that rising costs and financial risk simply would migrate from the Federal budget to seniors' household budgets? Wouldn't that

mean seniors would face higher premiums, eroding coverage, or both?

How do you propose to provide relief to millions of homeowners in this housing crisis? This budget dramatically cuts funding for public housing assistance, foreclosure mitigation programs, and neighborhood development activities. How do you anticipate that communities will be able to meet the housing needs of their most disadvantaged residents?

The Republican budget resolution will cut housing aid to 10,000 veterans each year, approximately one-third of the total number of homeless vets. How does the Republican budget plan on taking care of newly homeless veterans? Is cutting these services a fair reward for those who risked their lives in service to our country?

If students can no longer rely on Pell grants and other Federal assistance for their college education, how do you propose to increase the number of students going to college and improve America's system of education? This budget reduces Pell grants to the 2008 level and eliminates the grant increases that Democrats achieved previously, bringing the maximum grant award back down to \$5,000. But the budget does not seem to provide even enough funding for that amount.

In this budget, Republicans slash transportation investment in 2015 by \$52 billion. Do Republicans think that our infrastructure will magically fix itself, like they apparently do the rising inequality that this budget perpetuates? How many bridges have to collapse, and how many schools have to remain un-built so that we can provide another increase to our already bloated defense budget?

Madam Speaker, I am asking a lot of questions, because this budget does nothing but raise them, and provides no answers. It provides no answer for how we will help middle class families as they continue to struggle on Chairman RYAN's road to ruin. It provides no answer for how we will help low income families send their children to college. It provides no answer for how we will provide quality healthcare to our seniors and those who are one medical emergency away from bankruptcy. It provides no answer for how we will provide housing assistance to those who have served their country and need a helping hand getting back on their feet. The fact that we have to even debate these measures is outrageous.

Madam Speaker, we can do better. Not only can we do better, we have an obligation to the American people to do better. This budget utterly fails to meet that obligation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 544 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4415) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the

bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 2. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 4415 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 377) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4415 or H.R. 377.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition.

Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

BASELINE REFORM ACT OF 2013

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 539, I call up the bill (H.R. 1871) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to reform the budget baseline, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Pursuant to

House Resolution 539, the amendment recommended by the Committee on the Budget, printed in the bill, is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1871

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Baseline Reform Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. THE BASELINE.

Section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 257. THE BASELINE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) For any fiscal year, the baseline refers to a projection of current-year levels of new budget authority, outlays, or receipts and the surplus or deficit for the current year, the budget year, and the ensuing nine outyears based on laws enacted through the applicable date.

“(2) The baselines referred to in paragraph (1) shall be prepared annually.

“(b) DIRECT SPENDING AND RECEIPTS.—For the budget year and each outyear, estimates for direct spending in the baseline shall be calculated as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Laws providing or creating direct spending and receipts are assumed to operate in the manner specified in those laws for each such year and funding for entitlement authority is assumed to be adequate to make all payments required by those laws.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—(A)(i) No program established by a law enacted on or before the date of enactment of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 with estimated current year outlays greater than \$50,000,000 shall be assumed to expire in the budget year or the outyears. The scoring of new programs with estimated outlays greater than \$50,000,000 a year shall be based on scoring by the Committees on the Budget or OMB, as applicable. OMB, CBO, and the Committees on the Budget shall consult on the scoring of such programs where there are differences between CBO and OMB.

“(ii) On the expiration of the suspension of a provision of law that is suspended under section 171 of Public Law 104–127 and that authorizes a program with estimated fiscal year outlays that are greater than \$50,000,000, for purposes of clause (i), the program shall be assumed to continue to operate in the same manner as the program operated immediately before the expiration of the suspension.

“(B) The increase for veterans’ compensation for a fiscal year is assumed to be the same as that required by law for veterans’ pensions unless otherwise provided by law enacted in that session.

“(C) Excise taxes dedicated to a trust fund, if expiring, are assumed to be extended at current rates.

“(D) If any law expires before the budget year or any outyear, then any program with estimated current year outlays greater than \$50,000,000 that operates under that law shall be assumed to continue to operate under that law as in effect immediately before its expiration.

“(3) HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund shall be included in all calculations required by this Act.

“(c) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—For the budget year and each of the nine ensuing outyears, the baseline shall be calculated

using the following assumptions regarding all amounts other than those covered by subsection (b):

“(1) ESTIMATED APPROPRIATIONS.—Budgetary resources other than unobligated balances shall be at the level provided for the budget year in full-year appropriation Acts. If for any account a full-year appropriation has not yet been enacted, budgetary resources other than unobligated balances shall be at the level available in the current year.

“(2) CURRENT-YEAR APPROPRIATIONS.—If, for any account, a continuing appropriation is in effect for less than the entire current year, then the current-year amount shall be assumed to equal the amount that would be available if that continuing appropriation covered the entire fiscal year. If law permits the transfer of budget authority among budget accounts in the current year, the current-year level for an account shall reflect transfers accomplished by the submission of, or assumed for the current year in, the President’s original budget for the budget year.

“(d) UP-TO-DATE CONCEPTS.—In calculating the baseline for the budget year or each of the nine ensuing outyears, current-year amounts shall be calculated using the concepts and definitions that are required for that budget year.

“(e) ASSET SALES.—Amounts realized from the sale of an asset shall not be included in estimates under section 251, 251A, 252, or 253 of this part or section 5 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 if that sale would result in a financial cost to the Government as determined pursuant to scorekeeping guidelines.

“(f) LONG-TERM BUDGET OUTLOOK.—On or before July 1 of each year, CBO shall submit to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate the Long-Term Budget Outlook for the fiscal year commencing on October 1 of that year and at least the ensuing 40 fiscal years.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1871 in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I am pleased to be down here with the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Maryland, the gentleman whose opinion and counsel I have respect for.

What I love about the Budget Committee is that we have a chance to talk about issues that are defined by numbers in committee, but whose outcome is a difference in people’s lives back home.

After all, the reason the gentleman from Maryland is the highest ranking Democrat on the Budget Committee is not because he cares about math, it is because he cares about people. That is

who the Budget Committee consists of, Madam Speaker.

The bill that is before us today is a bill first conceived in this House by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT). I happen to be on the Budget Committee, I happen to have passion on this issue, so my name exists to carry this bill forward; but it has been an idea that has been around in this institution, and it says this.

We have all seen it. We have all been in townhall meetings, Madam Speaker, where you say: this is what we have done to spending for next year.

And somebody is going to raise their hand, and they are going to say: Rob, is that Washington math, or is that real math? Is this one of those things where you raise spending by \$10, but you call it a cut because you predicted you would raise spending by \$20 instead?

How sad is that? How sad is that, that in a country run by the American people, that they have to ask their representatives: Is this real math, or is this Washington math?

This bill, Madam Speaker, puts a stop to Washington math forever. It says this: don’t assume you are going to spend more money next year than you spent last year unless the law requires it.

Social Security is a good example of that. We raise Social Security each and every year. Why? Because the law of the land requires it, but not so in Federal budgeting rules.

In the crazy world of Federal budgeting, Madam Speaker, you raise spending next year just because. The assumption is: well, of course, they are going to spend more money than they did last year. Are they getting more bang for their buck?

I don’t know. Is the crisis still there? Does it still need to be funded? I don’t know, but we are going to assume more dollars go out the door.

My bill asks one thing and one thing only, Madam Speaker, that is to justify the American people’s tax dollars when they are spent. If you need more money next year, come to Congress and say so.

If it is a priority for my constituents back home, I promise you, you will get my “yes” vote, but gone are the days of assuming Congress will always spend more, irrespective of the merits.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate my friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for kicking off this debate.

As he indicated earlier, as we debate the budgets, there will be differences of opinion and differences of philosophy, but when it comes to math, there is not a Republican math, and there is not a Democratic math. When you run a math equation, you get the same result whether you are a Republican or a Democrat.

What this bill attempts to do is to legislate away inflation. Gee, that would be so nice if we could pass a law and inflation would go away. What is worse is this bill then says that we are going to put together budgets on the assumption that there is no inflation, on the assumption that the price of goods and services doesn't change over time, and if you do that, you will get very misleading results in your budget.

Now, the gentleman talked about Washington math. Madam Speaker, I would just like to show you the change in the cost of a hamburger from the last 10-year period. We do our budgets in 10-year windows. The price of a hamburger in 2004 was \$2.71. The price of that same hamburger 10 years later, in 2014, is \$4.62. That is not Washington math. That is reality-based math.

Here is what this Republican proposal would do.

It wants to take that fantasy land math and apply it to our budgets. Here is the chart. If you applied that idea in the budgets that we had from 2004 to today, you would assume that the price of that hamburger or of any goods and services that we bought as the Federal Government would remain the same—no inflation, no change—but that is not the reality. The reality is, between 2004 and 2014, we had inflation, and the costs of goods and services went up. The good news is that we did not have this proposal in effect from 2004 to 2014, so we didn't have this detachment from reality. Yet what our Republican colleagues want to do is say, from now on—from 2014 on—when the Congressional Budget Office puts together its estimations of future budgets, it has got to assume away inflation. Presto. As you can see, over time, that would become further and further detached from reality, not Washington reality but economic reality.

Here is what would happen if you budgeted that way.

For \$2.71 today, you don't get as big a hamburger, right? So apply that idea to an aircraft carrier. We have 10-year budgets. The gentleman's proposal is to pretend that, over the next 10 years, there will be no increase in the price of the inputs to making that aircraft carrier. Just assume it away. Inflation. Do you know what? If you plan that way, at the end of the day, you are going to have half an aircraft carrier in your budget just like you would have a half a hamburger in your budget.

Imagine a business that was planning ahead for the next 10 years, trying to do a profit and loss statement, and it had to calculate what it was going to cost it to buy inputs to its manufacturing process—energy inputs, oil and gas, other inputs of material it has to purchase. Then let's say that, today, it miraculously assumed there was no increase in the costs of those inputs. Boy, that would be nice, but do you know what? That private business would go under, and that business would be sued for malpractice by its shareholders.

Why would we do something to the Federal Government that we would never allow to happen in the private sector that would result in a private sector business's going belly up?

I would just say, Madam Speaker, that the reason the Congressional Budget Office projects the budgets as they do today—the reason they include the estimated costs of inflation—is not that they do Washington math. It is that they can go out and go to McDonald's and find out that—do you know what?—the price of a Big Mac is not the same today as it was 10 years ago. It would be misleading to pretend, as we put together our next 10-year budgets, that the price of aircraft carriers and the price of education and the price of providing health care to our veterans will be the same. If you assume that, at the end of the day, you shortchange those veterans, you shortchange that defense policy, you shortchange our kids because, just like you can only buy a half a hamburger today for what you could have in 2004, you are not going to be able to buy the same education for kids and the same military 10 years from now.

We are not talking about Washington math. This is a case of basic math. As I said, it shouldn't be a Republican math or a Democratic math. We would all love to repeal inflation. That is not the real world. Let's stick with real-world budgeting. If we get away from that, we are going to be in a world of trouble here in the United States Congress.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the control of the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds.

I think I have got one of the best chart teams on Capitol Hill. I will say to my friend from Maryland that that is a great Big Mac chart, and I think it drives home my point exactly, which is that Federal Government math assumes that, if you bought a Big Mac 10 years ago, you are still buying a Big Mac today. I just wonder if that is true. I have switched to the value menu. I get the McDoubles from time to time for 99 cents. The Spicy McChicken is now a part of what I do. I have to get into my wallet and justify the expense, and when prices double, sometimes we, as Americans, have to substitute.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. As you know, the value meal on that McDonald's menu 10 years ago cost more than the value meal today. This is just to get about math and budgeting in a transparent way.

Mr. WOODALL. In reclaiming my time, absolutely, inflation is not going to go away, but we have to make tough choices, and this bill requires us to make those choices in a transparent way for the American people.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), who first said that we must be transparent in this way, that we must be fair and honest in this way. He is the original author of the Baseline Reform Act.

Mr. GOHMERT. I am immensely grateful to my friend ROB WOODALL.

Madam Speaker, it was back in the 1990s when I heard what apparently was a loveable, old fuzzi-ball who turned out to be Rush Limbaugh. He was talking about the absurdity of the United States Government doing something that no person, no family, no business, no charity in all of America could do.

With due respect to my friend who just spoke, Mr. VAN HOLLEN says businesses would go out of business. I would challenge anybody in this room to show me a business, to show me a family, to show me an individual, to show me a charity that has an automatic increase in every year's budget, because America can't do that. I was shocked that this was going on. I mean, in the Army, I helped with the budget. In the private sector, I prepared budgets. As a district judge, I prepared a budget. It had to be approved. We never got an automatic increase. You had to justify any change in anything. If you needed an increase, you had to show why that was important.

I got to Congress, never dreaming that that would not have been taken care of when Republicans took the majority, but in my freshman term in 2005 and 2006, the Republican chair of the Budget Committee said we have to do the automatic increases. I said, Why? He said, Because it is the law. I was shocked. We make the law. We can change the law. Then, of course, our friends across the aisle took the majority, and for 4 years, there was no chance of eliminating the automatic increase in every Federal department's budget, but then we got the majority back.

For all of the disagreements I have had with the Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER agreed that if PAUL RYAN passed a zero-baseline budget—ending the automatic increases—out of committee, then he would bring it to the floor. It meant we would have to have the right guy marshaling this bill. Some tweaking was done, and I will be forever grateful to my friend ROB WOODALL, who is as brilliant as his predecessor, a dear friend, John Linder. He took this bill, and he marshaled it through. PAUL RYAN kept his word, and I will be forever grateful for that. It came to the floor, and we voted it through, and the Senate wouldn't take it up.

For those who want to talk about the children, I am not hearing a lot of that

talk today because, when I talk to college students, high school students, junior high students, they are wondering why they are going to have to pay the debts that we were not responsible enough to pay ourselves. There is not a good answer. It is absolutely immoral and negligent—it is self-indulgent—to say that one generation like ours is so much more important that we have to spend future generations' money. Yes, if there is inflation, let's deal with it that year, but I have heard enough stories from people who are talking about, gee, this department is apparently out there, saying, Spend all your money. Don't leave any because, if you don't, you won't get as much next year. Of course, they get automatic increases every year, so they have got to spend their money. That is no way to run a country. It is not right.

There are some issues I have with the budget, but I know the heart of the man who was behind that, and I know he wants future generations not to be burdened with our negligent handling of our money. So it is time that we end the automatic increases in every Federal budget. When my friend across the aisle was talking about, gee, you could end up with half an aircraft carrier—good grief—we have lost aircraft carriers because of those automatic increases every year for decades now. There are aircraft carriers that won't be there because we couldn't control ourselves as we had to automatically increase everything we spent.

Madam Speaker, it is time we did the responsible thing and ended the automatic increase in every single Federal budget for next year, and I will be continuing in my gratitude to my friend ROB WOODALL.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In response to the gentleman from Texas, I think it is important that we be careful in the rhetoric we use on these subjects. It is incorrect to say that, by law, there is an automatic increase in the Federal budget and that that applies to the discretionary budget. That is absolutely incorrect.

What we are talking about here and what this bill concerns is the CBO baseline that is used. The CBO reflects inflation in that baseline as does every serious budgeting professional and forecaster and economist in the real world, but they don't do it because the law has told them they have to or because Democrats have told them they have to; they do it because that is what serious budget forecasters do. They know that inflation is a reality, and they believe that the baselines they use and the projections and forecasts they use should reflect that reality. I think that is an important clarification. We choose to budget and to spend at the level that we choose to do so each and every year. What the CBO does as a matter of baseline projections is a different matter.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), a distinguished member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank my colleague from California for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the Baseline Reform Act does nothing to address the economic challenges facing American families. It does not create a single job. It does not renew expired unemployment compensation for the millions of workers and their families who are struggling right now. It does not raise the minimum wage to a living wage. What it would do is essentially impose sequestration on steroids in our budgetary baseline, and we all pretty much agree that sequestration was a terrible idea that was holding the country back.

The bill in front of us today simply establishes an unrealistic and misleading benchmark against which to measure changes in government spending.

□ 1400

Requiring the CBO and the OMB to construct budget baselines without adjusting for inflation will serve only to weaken fiscal discipline and result in wildly inaccurate long-term spending projections.

Madam Speaker, inflation is an accepted part of a growing economy. In fact, the United States has seen year-to-year increases in the prices of goods and services over every calendar year but one since 1956, the notable exception being 2009 when our economy was mired in the Great Recession. On average, inflation has hovered near 4 percent annually over that nearly six-decade window. It is simply inevitable that goods and services become more expensive over time and the purchasing power of the dollar will be weaker in 10 years than it is today.

Although 2 to 3 percent annual inflation may not appear to be significant at first blush, rest assured that even such a modest inflationary rate will produce considerable price differences over the long term. Using the Federal Reserve's targeted 2 percent annual rate of inflation, an item that costs \$100 today will cost \$122 just 10 years from now. At 3 percent annual inflation, that same \$100 good will cost almost \$135 10 years from now. In total, the price of goods and services in the United States have increased by more than 1000 percent since World War II.

Under longstanding budget rules, CBO and OMB assume that future discretionary appropriations at the account level will be at the same dollar levels but adjusted for inflation. Why do they do this? They do it because it represents a more accurate analysis of our Nation's actual spending habits. The aggregate total of defense and non-defense appropriations are then adjusted down to the spending cap levels

set in law, but even those spending caps are higher than the freeze mandated by this bill.

The CBO's current projections for the next 10 years assume that discretionary spending will be at the caps imposed by the Budget Control Act through 2021, rather than the inflation-adjusted levels. But changing the definition of the budget baseline will have an outsized impact on future budget projections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman such additional time as he may consume.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Discretionary appropriations are responsible for many of the programs that Americans hold sacred, including education, veterans' benefits, defense, disease research and control, food safety, transportation projects, and the list goes on. By eliminating inflation adjustments and freezing discretionary spending over 10 years, the baseline would be a benchmark that builds in real—and deep—cuts in Federal programs.

The so-called "reforms" contained within this bill are nothing more than efforts at constraining future Federal spending through budget trickery. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a champion for budget transparency and a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, our Constitution assigns the principal responsibility over the public purse to the House of Representatives. Under that constitutional doctrine, a dollar can't be spent by this government unless the House says it gets spent. Yet today, spending increasingly seems to be out of our hands, driven automatically by a variety of provisions and practices that thwart the very design of the Constitution. Roughly two-thirds of our spending is for entitlements, over which we have lost any direct control in the appropriations process. That is the big problem.

But there are other reasons for this problem as well that this bill addresses. One of them is the current process by which we calculate the baseline from which we begin our annual budget negotiations. Any family would begin its budget process by asking, for example: What did we spend for groceries last year? Once it has that baseline, then it would begin to adjust for changing circumstances. The price of milk is going up. Should we cut back or look for substitutes? Or should we cut back on something else to afford that increase?

That is the rational process known to every reasonably well-managed family. This process gives budgeters, whether they are a household or the House of Representatives, the ability to adjust for changing priorities, needs, and conditions. Yet the Federal budget process

builds in a variety of spending increases above and beyond what we had previously agreed we could afford—before our budget deliberations even begin.

That same family doesn't begin its budget process by building in assumptions of how it might change its spending in the future. For example, if it took vacations the last several years, it doesn't automatically budget for a vacation next year until it has met its other needs, that is, it doesn't budget for decisions that it has not yet made. But we do, quite routinely.

Thus, we begin the budget process with a baseline that hides the many tough decisions that a budget requires: How do we cope with price increases? Should we continue to deviate from our spending plan next year just because we did last year?

The current budget process denies us the perspective that any family has when prices go up or conditions change. It often prevents us from asking the questions that a family would ask under these circumstances. Instead, we sweep these issues under the rug—or, more precisely, we sweep them into the baseline.

Does this bill make our job harder? Yes, because it requires us to figure out how to cope with changing conditions. Right now, we start our budget by assuming that we are hostages to our spending. This measure makes us the masters of that spending. That is a harder job, but that is our job.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank Mr. WOODALL for all of his hard work on this issue, as well as Mr. GOHMERT, who was here a moment ago, for raising this issue, for keeping focus and attention on it, and for bringing this much-needed reform through the House Budget Committee and to the House floor.

This bill basically fixes a real quirk in our budget process. Under the current law, the Congressional Budget Office assumes every discretionary spending account gets an increase every year to keep up with inflation.

What does that mean? This means that this increase is built into the baseline, and the baseline is our starting point of spending. It is our starting point of budgeting. So every year, Congress moves the line forward. It assumes that there is always going to be an increase in every one of these programs, regardless of the facts on the ground. There is no consideration to whether a program is working or not or even whether it is still necessary.

Under this bill, the baseline would just show the previous year's funding level. That is basically what we are saying. If we are spending X amount of dollars today, when we write next

year's budget, we will start with X, and then we will make a decision here in Congress: Should it be more or less or the same?

That is not how it works today. We spend X today, then there is an automatic increase, and then we decide how to budget after that automatic increase.

We should write the Federal budget just like families write their own budgets. They don't get an automatic increase. They don't get to decide like that.

We have got record deficits. We have got an unprecedented debt. Our job here in Congress is to make decisions. It is to set priorities. It is to look at the hardworking taxpayers that are working so hard to pay their taxes, to raise their families, and tell them we are going to watch their money more closely than just assuming automatically each and every year we can just take more from them and then decide how to spend more on top of that. It is no way to run a budget. It is no way to run a government budget or a family budget or a business budget.

So that is all we are saying. This, I think, is an inflated baseline which is a smoke-and-mirror move. What we are saying is take away the smoke and the mirrors, start from scratch, and then make informed decisions from there. That is why I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for all of his hard work on this. That is why I encourage all Members on both sides of the aisle to support this much-needed reform.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I think this may be one of the more oversold bills we have heard in a while.

We keep hearing references to autopilot spending in mandatory programs. This bill doesn't have anything to do with them.

We keep hearing references to automatic annual increases in spending. We don't have such automatic annual increases.

This is about the budget baseline that the CBO assumes for purposes of helping us make our decisions.

We keep hearing about families and how they budget. I would submit, Madam Speaker, that any family that has reason to believe that some part of their budget is going to increase in the coming year had better reflect that in the reality of their budget or else they are not going to be able to meet their needs.

If they have reason to believe their rent is going up, if they have reason to believe that their utilities are going to cost more, if they have reason to believe that anything that they spend money on is going to cost more, in the real world of America, families do include that in their budget. That is called reality, and that is what the CBO does.

I would love to face a future in which Big Macs cost the same thing 10 years

from now as they do today. I wish I were still paying \$2.71 for a Big Mac, as Mr. VAN HOLLEN's chart showed. But the truth is, in the real world, we know that is not how it works. We know that inflation is reality. If we were in a deflationary or a zero-inflation environment, then I suspect the CBO would create its baselines differently. But we are not, and no one is arguing that we are.

They are just asking us to suspend disbelief and try to legislate away the reality of inflation. Why? So that the budget-cutting, government-reducing agendas that we hear in this House year after year might appear to be a little less draconian in the outyears. That is not a very compelling argument when you think about it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I would say to my friend from California that I do not have any further speakers remaining. I am prepared to close.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This bill does not create any jobs. It doesn't save one dime. It doesn't reduce spending. It simply asks the CBO to pretend that the reality of inflation does not exist. It is not a serious proposal. It is a bill that was heard and passed largely on party lines in the last Congress. It didn't go anywhere. It is not going to go anywhere this time either. This is political theater at a time when we really need to be talking in this institution about the real needs of America.

With that, I request a "no" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I brought down a chart that takes us from 2006 out to 2044. For almost everyone here in the Chamber, that it going to get into the meaty part of our lifetime.

What it shows with the green line, Madam Speaker, is what revenues have been in this country, historic revenues going backward and projected going forward, not in dollar values but as a percent of our economy. What it shows us is that revenues going forward will continue to be historically normal at just under 20 percent of GDP.

But the red line, Madam Speaker, represents projected spending. This is the projected spending if we do nothing at all. We don't need to show up for work another day in this Chamber. We don't need to come down here and pass one new law, spend one more dollar. The spending on autopilot, Madam Speaker, is represented by the red line. You see it rising off the top of the graph.

Spending is the problem. For decades, since 1974 and the passage of the Congressional Budget Act, there has been an assumption that spending was going to rise each and every year. My friends on the Democratic side of the aisle called it inflation. Inflation existed before the Congressional Budget

Act was passed. It is going to exist after the Congressional Budget Act is modified or repealed. Inflation is an economic certainty, and that is not the topic of discussion today.

The topic of discussion today is who makes decisions when it comes to America's budgeting. If spending is the problem, if it is spending that is rising faster than revenues, if it is spending that has changed over the past decade, who should make those determinations?

Here is the thing, Madam Speaker. I will go back to that Washington math that I talked about coming from town-hall meetings, because I know everyone here has been a part of that. I know everyone here has had that hand go up when we talk about cutting spending and they say: Is that a real cut or is that a Washington cut? When you say "cutting spending," ROB, do you mean cutting spending or do you mean that you are only going to increase it by \$10 and the projection was it is was going to go up by \$20?

Only here is increasing spending by \$10 considered a cut. There is no family in America that considers that a cut.

□ 1415

Think about your budget back home, Madam Speaker, whatever that is. I remember buying milk for \$1.99 a gallon. I am a big milk drinker. Skim is my favorite. But \$1.99 I was comfortable paying. Today I am prepared to pay more—I am. There has been inflation. I am prepared to pay \$4 a gallon for a gallon of milk.

I didn't assume that I was going to drink the same amount of milk every day going forward. In fact, I confess, I found powdered milk, Madam Speaker. It was on the discount shelf at Giant. I got two gallons of powdered milk for \$2.25 total. That is \$1.12 a gallon for that powdered milk. I am not paying \$4 a gallon. I am paying \$1.12 because I have to make choices.

American families don't get unlimited dollars to spend. Though, the Federal Government pretends like it does.

We are borrowing from future generations every time we make a decision. So this bill says one thing and one thing only: Who makes decisions for America? Is it going to be the Congressional Budget Office? Is it going to be a statutory baseline, or is it going to be the men and women in this room who put themselves up for election every 2 years?

Madam Speaker, for me, the answer is clear. I have got a Constitution that lays it out fairly clearly here in my pocket. I don't think I need to read it to folks here to get them to understand because I think we all share that view.

We share the view that difficult decisions are not supposed to be made by unelected bureaucrats in a back room. Difficult decisions are supposed to be made by us, right here in this Chamber.

If you have a project back home in your district, if you see a national pri-

ority, and you want to spend a penny more than we spent last year, come to the floor of the House and make your case. Make your case. For Pete's sake, I am a huge supporter of Federal research. The work that goes on at the CDC down in Atlanta, the work that goes on in Maryland at NIH, it is amazing. Nobody else is going to do that if we don't come together and do it here in this body.

I have got to tell you something. I don't need a baseline. I don't need a bureaucrat. I don't need any Washington math to come and make the case that we ought to spend more at NIH next year than we did last year. Why do I not need them? Because I believe it. Because my constituents elected me to stand up for Federal research. We came here to make these tough decisions.

Back in the day, before the class of 2010, before the class of 2012—back in the day, there is good reason to assume that Federal spending was going to go up every year because every year since the end of the Korean war that is exactly what happened. I watched it. Every year, we spent more than we did in the last.

Something has changed in this town, Madam Speaker, and I think the thing that has changed in this town are the people that the folks back home are sending to this town. I think the town's actually the same. I think the folks back home are sending new folks, folks like the gentleman from California, folks like the gentleman from North Carolina. Sending people to town with the direction of not trading away their children's future because they are afraid to make tough decisions today.

So, what does that mean? That means in the 4 years I have been in this institution, Madam Speaker, we have spent less money in these discretionary accounts that this bill would affect every single year than we did the one before. Think about that.

In the absence of this legislation that I am proposing, we are going to go assume that spending goes up every year, but the reality that my friends on the other side of the aisle are talking about, the reality of inflation, the reality of congressional decisionmaking, the reality of our budget is that that spending has gone down, not just from 2010 to 2011, though it did; not just again from 2011 to 2012, though it did; not just again from 2012 to 2013, though it did; and not just again from 2013 to 2014, but it did that too. Four years in a row we spent less the following year than we did the year before.

When are we going to get back to that 2010 level of spending? Is it going to be next year? No, it is not. Is it going to be the year after that? No, not by the budgets that we will be passing on the floor here this week. What about the year after? No, not then either.

So, the opponents of this legislation suggest that we should create a process in Federal law that assumes that spending goes up every single year, and

yet the reality of this institution, as it exists today, not as it existed 10 years ago, not as it existed 20 years ago, not as it existed in 1974, when this legislation was first enacted, but as it exists today, is the responsible men and women in this Chamber who are prioritizing taxpayer dollars in such a way that for the entire 10-year window we won't spend a penny more than we did on day one. That is the reality.

Could we spend more each and every year? Of course we could. Could we borrow more and more from our children and grandchildren and ask them to pay it back tomorrow with interest? Of course we could. Did our constituents elect us to come here and make difficult, difficult, difficult discussions? They did.

I was in the Rules Committee last night, Madam Speaker. My colleague from Massachusetts said, Some of these decisions have real consequences for folks back home. I disagree. I think every decision has real consequences for folks back home. Every single one.

This legislation simply asks that before we spend another penny from folks back home that we come to the floor of this House, to the committee chambers around this institution, and make the case for why it is worth doing. I challenge you to look in the eyes of young people whose future we are mortgaging and suggest that they deserve anything less.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. BUSTOS. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Bustos moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1871 to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITING CUTS IN EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND SAFETY PROTECTIONS.

The amendment made by section 2 shall not apply to the following:

(1) Student loans or available per-pupil expenditures for the education of children with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.).

(2) Benefits, payments, or funds to expedite unprocessed claims for veterans who have

pending disability compensation or education claims.

(3) Programs to protect the safety of patients in nursing homes and other places of care to ensure compliance with the law and best health care practices.

(4) Air traffic safety control, food safety inspectors, or law enforcement officers under the COPS program.

Mr. WOODALL (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, and it will not delay or kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed immediately to final passage as amended.

Madam Speaker, the bill before us today, the Baseline Reform Act, would politicize what is otherwise a simple, straightforward method of accurately measuring changes and spending policies. It is misguided.

Here is why. It mandates that the Congressional Budget Office assume current discretionary spending is frozen indefinitely in its baseline projections rather than adjusted for inflation. This change would undermine the usefulness of the CBO's baselines.

It would make it more difficult to measure the real-world impact of changes in discretionary spending at both the program and budget function levels. Were this bill to be enacted into law and inflation remained at current projections, the CBO's baseline projections by the end of the budget window, or 10 years out, would purchase about one-fifth less than in the current year.

My amendment would blunt the damage this bill could cause, and it would protect many of our hardworking and most vulnerable constituents. Specifically, my amendment would protect programs that help students and help families afford the skyrocketing costs of higher education. It would protect children with disabilities from being kicked out of the classroom. It would protect our brave veterans and the benefits they have earned and deserve through their valiant service to our Nation. It would protect vulnerable seniors in nursing homes. It would protect our air traffic controllers who keep us safe when we travel, our food safety inspectors who help protect us from disease, and first responders who help keep our communities safe.

Madam Speaker, when I am home traveling in my district every weekend, I hear from people who this bill would harm: young people who are trying to better themselves through higher education but struggling to afford the rising cost of college; veterans who are caught in the VA backlog and trying to just get the care that they need; seniors who worked hard and played by

the rules their entire lives, who deserve to live out their golden years in dignity; and law enforcement officers, like my husband, Gerry, a captain with the Rock Island County Sheriff's Department and commander of the Quad Cities Bomb Squad, who rely on programs like the COPS program to help keep our community safe.

Madam Speaker, my amendment would help protect the smart investment we have made in the future of our country: in our seniors, in our veterans, and in those who fight to protect us and keep us safe.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of the motion to recommit. I will read from line 1. It says: Section 3: Prohibiting cuts in education, health, and safety protections.

I said something that generally speaking here on this floor we agree on, but it makes the case of why this bill is so necessary. Because this bill has nothing to do with cuts in any account, no cuts in education, no cuts in health, no cuts in safety protections.

This bill does one thing and one thing only, and that is to say, let's spend next year what we spent this year, unless someone makes the case to do more.

I thought the gentlewoman from Illinois made a powerful case for why it is important to pay close attention to these accounts and focus the dollars on those accounts that we can do the most good. But to solve this misunderstanding that there are cuts in baseline budgeting, to solve this misunderstanding that prevails across the conversations across America, let's support H.R. 1871. I reject this motion to recommit.

I support the underlying bill, Madam Speaker, and I ask that we can bring fairness and transparency to the budget again for the first time since 1974.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 544; and adoption of House Resolution 544, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 191, nays 221, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

YEAS—191

Barber	Green, Al	Nolan
Barrow (GA)	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Beatty	Grijalva	Owens
Becerra	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Bera (CA)	Hahn	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Bonamici	Higgins	Peters (CA)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Peters (MI)
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Bustos	Honda	Pocan
Butterfield	Horsford	Polis
Capps	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Capuano	Huffman	Quigley
Cárdenas	Israel	Rahall
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Richmond
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Jones	Ruppersberger
Chu	Kaptur	Rush
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	T.
Clay	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kind	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kuster	Schiff
Connolly	Langevin	Schneider
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Courtney	Levin	Serrano
Crowley	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Cuellar	Loeb	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Loeb	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Sinema
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Sires
DeFazio	Lowey	Slaughter
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
Delaney	(NM)	Speier
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	(NM)	Takano
Deutch	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Maffei	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Maloney,	Tierney
Doyle	Carolyn	Titus
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Edwards	Matheson	Tsongas
Ellison	Matsui	Van Hollen
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Vargas
Enyart	McCollum	Veasey
Eshoo	McDermott	Vela
Esty	McGovern	Velázquez
Farr	McIntyre	Walz
Fattah	McNerney	Wasserman
Foster	Meeks	Schultz
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Waters
Fudge	Michaud	Waxman
Gabbard	Miller, George	Welch
Gallo	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Garcia	Nadler	
Grayson	Napolitano	
	Negrete McLeod	

NAYS—221

Aderholt	Calvert	DesJarlais
Amash	Camp	Diaz-Balart
Amodei	Cantor	Duffy
Bachmann	Capito	Duncan (SC)
Bachus	Cassidy	Duncan (TN)
Barletta	Chabot	Ellmers
Barr	Chaffetz	Farenthold
Barton	Coble	Fitzpatrick
Benishek	Coffman	Fleischmann
Bentivolio	Cole	Fleming
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Flores
Bishop (UT)	Collins (NY)	Forbes
Black	Conaway	Fortenberry
Blackburn	Cook	Fox
Boustany	Cotton	Franks (AZ)
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Gardner
Bridenstine	Crawford	Garrett
Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw	Gerlach
Brooks (IN)	Culberson	Gibbs
Brown (GA)	Daines	Gibson
Buchanan	Davis, Rodney	Gingrey (GA)
Bucshon	Denham	Gohmert
Burgess	Dent	Goodlatte
Byrne	DeSantis	Gosar

Gowdy	Massie	Roskam	Barletta	Grimm	Perry	Grijalva	Maffei	Sánchez, Linda
Granger	McCarthy (CA)	Ross	Barr	Guthrie	Peterson	Gutiérrez	Maloney,	T.
Graves (GA)	McCaul	Rothfus	Barrow (GA)	Hall	Petri	Hahn	Carolyn	Sanchez, Loretta
Graves (MO)	McClintock	Royce	Barton	Harper	Pittenger	Hanabusa	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes
Griffin (AR)	McHenry	Ryan (WI)	Benishke	Harris	Pitts	Hastings (FL)	Matsui	Schakowsky
Griffith (VA)	McKeon	Salmon	Bentivolio	Hartzler	Poe (TX)	Heck (WA)	McCarthy (NY)	Schiff
Grimm	McKinley	Sanford	Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Pompeo	Higgins	McCollum	Schneider
Guthrie	McMorris	Scalise	Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Posey	Himes	McDermott	Schrader
Hall	Rodgers	Schock	Black	Hensarling	Price (GA)	Hinojosa	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Harper	Meadows	Schweikert	Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Reed	Holt	McNerney	Scott, David
Harris	Meehan	Scott, Austin	Boustany	Holding	Reichert	Honda	Meeks	Serrano
Hartzler	Messer	Sensenbrenner	Brady (TX)	Hudson	Renacci	Horsford	Meng	Sewell (AL)
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Sessions	Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Ribble	Hoyer	Michaud	Shea-Porter
Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)	Shimkus	Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)	Huffman	Miller, George	Sherman
Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Shuster	Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rigell	Israel	Moore	Sires
Herrera Beutler	Mullin	Simpson	Broun (GA)	Hunter	Roby	Jackson Lee	Moran	Slaughter
Holding	Mulvaney	Smith (MO)	Buchanan	Hurt	Roe (TN)	Jeffries	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Hudson	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)	Bucshon	Issa	Rogers (AL)	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Speier
Huelskamp	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)	Burgess	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)	Johnson, E. B.	Negrete McLeod	Swalwell (CA)
Huizenga (MI)	Noem	Smith (TX)	Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (MI)	Kaptur	Nolan	Takano
Hultgren	Nugent	Southerland	Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher	Kelly (IL)	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
Hunter	Nunes	Stivers	Camp	Jolly	Rokita	Kennedy	Owens	Thompson (MS)
Hurt	Nunnelee	Stutzman	Cantor	Jones	Rooney	Kildee	Pallone	Tierney
Issa	Olson	Terry	Capito	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen	Kilmer	Pascarell	Titus
Jenkins	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)	Cassidy	Joyce	Roskam	Kind	Pastor (AZ)	Tonko
Johnson (OH)	Paulsen	Thornberry	Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Ross	Kirkpatrick	Payne	Tsongas
Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Tiberi	Chaffetz	King (IA)	Rothfus	Kuster	Pelosi	Van Hollen
Jolly	Perry	Tipton	Coble	King (NY)	Royce	Langevin	Peters (CA)	Vargas
Jordan	Petri	Turner	Coffman	Kingston	Ryan (WI)	Larsen (WA)	Peters (MI)	Veasey
Joyce	Pittenger	Upton	Cole	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon	Larson (CT)	Pingree (ME)	Vela
Kelly (PA)	Pitts	Valadao	Collins (GA)	Kline	Sanford	Lee (CA)	Pocan	Velázquez
King (IA)	Poe (TX)	Wagner	Collins (NY)	Labrador	Scalise	Levin	Polis	Visclosky
King (NY)	Pompeo	Walberg	Conaway	LaMalfa	Schock	Lipinski	Price (NC)	Walz
Kingston	Posey	Walden	Cook	Lamborn	Schweikert	Loeb sack	Quigley	Wasserman
Kinzing er (IL)	Price (GA)	Walorski	Cotton	Lance	Scott, Austin	Lofgren	Rahall	Schultz
Kline	Reed	Weber (TX)	Cramer	Lankford	Sensenbrenner	Lowenthal	Rangel	Waters
Labrador	Reichert	Webster (FL)	Crawford	Latham	Sessions	Lowe y	Richmond	Waxman
LaMalfa	Renacci	Wenstrup	Crenshaw	Latta	Shimkus	Lujan Grisham	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Lamborn	Ribble	Westmoreland	Culberson	LoBiondo	Shuster	(NM)	Ruiz	Wilson (FL)
Lance	Rice (SC)	Whitfield	Daines	Long	Simpson	Luján, Ben Ray	Ruppersberger	Yarmuth
Lankford	Rigell	Williams	Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Sinema	(NM)	Rush	
Latham	Roby	Wilson (SC)	Denham	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)	Lynch	Ryan (OH)	
Latta	Roe (TN)	Wittman	Dent	Lummis	Smith (NE)			
LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	Wolf	DeSantis	Marchant	Smith (NJ)			
Long	Rogers (KY)	Womack	DesJarlais	Marino	Smith (TX)			
Lucas	Rogers (MI)	Woodall	Diaz-Balart	Matheson	Southerland			
Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher	Yoder	Duffy	McCarthy (CA)	Stivers			
Lummis	Rokita	Yoho	Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Stutzman			
Marchant	Rooney	Young (AK)	Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Terry			
Marino	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (IN)	Ellmers	McClintock	Thompson (PA)			

NOT VOTING—19

Bass	Keating	Runyan
Brown (FL)	Lewis	Schwartz
Campbell	McAllister	Stewart
Carter	Miller, Gary	Stockman
Fincher	Moran	Visclosky
Frelinghuysen	Neal	
Hanna	Perlmutter	

□ 1456

Messrs. SHIMKUS, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and MICA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. COHEN, HASTINGS of Florida, GARAMENDI, and Ms. MCCOLLUM changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HUFFMAN: Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 185, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

AYES—230

Aderholt	Amodei	Bachus
Amash	Bachmann	Barber

Beatty	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Becerra	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Bera (CA)	Clay	Doyle
Bishop (GA)	Cleaver	Duckworth
Bishop (NY)	Clyburn	Edwards
Blumenauer	Cohen	Ellison
Bonamici	Connolly	Engel
Brady (PA)	Conyers	Enyart
Braley (IA)	Cooper	Eshoo
Brownley (CA)	Costa	Esty
Bustos	Courtney	Farr
Butterfield	Crowley	Fattah
Capps	Cuellar	Foster
Capuano	Cummings	Frankel (FL)
Cárdenas	Davis (CA)	Fudge
Carney	Davis, Danny	Gabbard
Carson (IN)	DeFazio	Gallego
Cartwright	DeGette	Garamendi
Castor (FL)	Delaney	Garcia
Castro (TX)	DeLauro	Grayson
Chu	DeBene	Green, Al
Ciilline	Deutch	Green, Gene

NOES—185

Clark (MA)	Dingell
Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Clay	Doyle
Cleaver	Duckworth
Clyburn	Edwards
Cohen	Ellison
Connolly	Engel
Conyers	Enyart
Cooper	Eshoo
Costa	Esty
Courtney	Farr
Crowley	Fattah
Cuellar	Foster
Cummings	Frankel (FL)
Davis (CA)	Fudge
Davis, Danny	Gabbard
DeFazio	Gallego
DeGette	Garamendi
Delaney	Garcia
DeLauro	Grayson
DeBene	Green, Al
Deutch	Green, Gene

NOT VOTING—16

Bass	Keating	Runyan
Brown (FL)	Lewis	Schwartz
Campbell	McAllister	Stewart
Carter	Miller, Gary	Stockman
Fincher	Neal	
Hanna	Perlmutter	

□ 1503

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 96, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM APRIL 11, 2014, THROUGH APRIL 25, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 544) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024, and providing for proceedings from April 11, 2014, through April 24, 2014, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 190, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

YEAS—219

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Billakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)

Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—190

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright

Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny

DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)

Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard

Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradner
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—22

Barton
Bass
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Byrne
Carter
Fincher

Grijalva
Hanna
Hurt
Kaptur
Keating
Lewis
McAllister
Miller, Gary

Neal
Perlmutter
Runyan
Schwartz
Stewart
Stockman

□ 1510

So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT. Madam Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 169, on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 544. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 194, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

AYES—222

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio

Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)

Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy

Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren

Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert

Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—194

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers

Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi

Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster

Langevin	Nadler	Scott (VA)
Larsen (WA)	Napolitano	Scott, David
Larson (CT)	Negrete McLeod	Serrano
Lee (CA)	Nolan	Sewell (AL)
Levin	O'Rourke	Shea-Porter
Lewis	Owens	Sherman
Lipinski	Pallone	Sinema
Loeb sack	Pascarell	Sires
Lofgren	Pastor (AZ)	Slaughter
Lowenthal	Payne	Smith (WA)
Lowe y	Pelosi	Speier
Lujan Grisham	Peters (CA)	Swalwell (CA)
(NM)	Peters (MI)	Takano
Luján, Ben Ray	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
(NM)	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (MS)
Lynch	Pocan	Tierney
Maffei	Polis	Titus
Maloney,	Price (NC)	Tonko
Carolyn	Quigley	Tsongas
Maloney, Sean	Rahall	Van Hollen
Matheson	Rangel	Vargas
Matsui	Richmond	Veasey
McCarthy (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Vela
McCollum	Ruiz	Velázquez
McDermott	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
McGovern	Rush	Walz
McIntyre	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
McNerney	Sánchez, Linda	T. Schultz
Meeks	T.	Waters
Meng	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Michaud	Sarbanes	Welch
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
Moore	Schiff	Yarmuth
Moran	Schneider	
Murphy (FL)	Schrader	

NOT VOTING—15

Bass	Joyce	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Keating	Runyan
Carter	McAllister	Schwartz
Fincher	Miller, Gary	Stewart
Hanna	Neal	Stockman

□ 1517

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 96.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 544 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 96.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1521

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Govern-

ment for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 4 hours, with 3 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), or their designees.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 90 minutes of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am here to rise in support of H. Con. Res. 96, for the fiscal year 2015.

This is the fourth year we have done this—this being bringing a budget to the floor to balance the budget and pay down the national debt.

This is exactly what our economy needs today. We ask the Congressional Budget Office to look at this kind of deficit reduction. What would it do? Well, it is very clear that it would promote economic growth.

In 2024, economic output would be 1.8 percent higher than it otherwise would be. What does that mean? That means by getting our fiscal house in order, by balancing our budget, paying off our debt, and reducing the deficit, take-home pay for Americans will be \$1,100 higher than it otherwise would be if we don't do something like this. That is just part of our budget.

We also call for more job creation, economic growth policies like tax reform, and energy development. All of these things would help get our economy back on track.

I also understand that there is a lot of confusion about what is going on in our budget. I would like to spend a few moments sort of clarifying and clearing up some of that confusion.

First, our budget does repeal ObamaCare. Let me say it again. Our budget does repeal ObamaCare because we think it is going to do great damage to our economy, to our budget, to health care. We don't keep the tax hikes in ObamaCare. Instead, we propose revenue neutral comprehensive tax reform. Our critics like to claim we are keeping it. What we are saying is let's scrap this Tax Code in favor of a better Tax Code, including replacing ObamaCare taxes with pro-growth tax reform to create jobs, increase take-home pay, and get this economy growing.

Second, we end the raid on Medicare. The dirty little secret that the other side won't want to talk about is the fact that they turned Medicare into a piggy bank for ObamaCare. They raided \$716 billion from Medicare to pay for ObamaCare. We say that those savings from Medicare need to stay with Medicare to make it more solvent, and if some of those savings from Medicare are doing damage to the Medicare provider network, like reducing access to things like Medicare Advantage, then we have a mechanism in here to make sure that we can fix that, just like we did for the SGR, otherwise known as the "doc fix."

We think we need to save and strengthen this program, not only so that it is there intact for those in the near retirement, but for future generations who are facing a bankrupt program if we don't do something to reform it.

Second, we don't slash the safety net. If anything, we strengthen the safety net.

This administration has made all sorts of promises that it has no way of keeping, or it has made all sorts of promises and it is not telling us in any way how they are going to keep these promises. It has promised major expansions in programs like Medicaid and Pell grants. How they plan to pay for it, we have no idea. We refuse to be complicit with the demise of these programs.

We spend \$3.5 trillion over the next 10 years on Medicaid. Under our budget, program spending will continue to rise by population plus inflation. We grow the program each and every year after fiscal year 2016 onward. We simply slow the growth rate by giving Governors and State legislators more flexibility to customize these programs to meet the unique needs of their populations instead of cramming down their throats some one-size-fits-all Washington-knows-best approach, which has been failing the Medicare population in our health care provider network.

This budget spends \$600 billion over the next 10 years on food stamps. It is a program that has quadrupled since 2002. We propose to give Governors more flexibility so that they can customize this program to meet the needs of their populations, but not until 2019, until CBO says the economy will have recovered by then.

CBO says that the Pell grant is going bankrupt. It is going to face a fiscal shortfall in 2016 and every year thereafter. So instead of making all these Pell promises that the government has no way of keeping, the budget maintains the current Pell award, \$5,730, throughout each of the next 10 years and funds it.

Our budget all told cuts \$5.1 trillion in spending over the next 10 years. We do this by cutting waste, by cutting abuse, by stopping the age-old Washington practice of spending money we just don't have, and by making much needed reforms to government programs.

Our critics call this draconian. Look at it this way. On the current path, we are set to spend \$48 trillion of hard-working taxpayer dollars or borrow it from the next generation—\$48 trillion over the next 10 years. Under this path, we will spend \$43 trillion.

By contrast, under the current path, Federal Government spending is slated to rise by 5.2 percent on average for the next decade. Under this budget, it will rise by 3.5 percent over the next decade. Hardly draconian.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing compassionate about making promises that the government cannot keep. When that bill comes due, it is going to hurt the vulnerable, the first and the worst, and the voiceless. This is why we need to get spending under control.

Let me show you what we are proposing in a nutshell. The red shows you our national debt. Our national debt is on course to hit catastrophic levels. Our national debt is going to hit these catastrophic levels which guarantee that the next generation of Americans inherit a bleak future, a lower standard of living, a burden of debt that they cannot have a high standard of living with.

We in our generation have to make tough choices. We have got to face up to this issue. What we are saying here with this budget is, the sooner we get on top of our fiscal problems, the better off everybody is going to be.

□ 1530

We are saying, if we get ahead of these problems now, we can phase in reforms, such as Medicare reforms that don't even affect people in or near retirement. The sooner we tackle these fiscal problems, the better off everybody is going to be, the faster the economy grows, and the more we can guarantee that the next generation inherits a debt-free future.

We have never given the next generation a diminished future in this country before. That is the great legacy of this Nation, work hard and make tough choices, so that the next generation can be better off. We know, without a shadow of a doubt, that that is not going to be the case.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, we know that, in a couple of years, the debt starts taking back off, and we are back to \$1 trillion deficits. Our tax revenues are at an alltime high this year. The problem is that spending is outpacing that. The sooner we can get our fiscal house in order, the sooner we can create jobs and get economic growth.

The sooner we can bring solvency to our safety net, to our social contract, the more that people can depend on these programs, and the sooner we can bring these reforms to get our spending in line with our revenues, the faster we can pay off this debt.

Just like a family, a government that lives beyond its means today necessarily has to live below its means tomorrow. We want to make right by the

next generation. We want to grow this economy.

We want to create jobs and increase take-home pay, and we want to get people to work. That is what this budget is designed to do, and that is why I am proud to bring this balanced budget to the floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are looking forward to the debate on the budget over the next couple of days. Chairman RYAN mentioned that the critics of this budget call it draconian. I would just point out to the gentleman that the Republican chairman of the House Appropriations Committee just referred to the budget that is before this House as draconian.

Now, the chairman and I do agree on one thing, which is that these budgets that we bring before this Congress reflect our different visions of America. They reflect the choices that we make. They show what we care about, and they show what we care less about. They are fundamentally different blueprints for the future of this country.

The President has presented a budget that will boost job growth, sharpen Americans' competitive edge, and expand opportunity in the United States of America. Now, we have before us the congressional Republican budget, and of all of the Republican budgets that we have seen on the floor of this House since 2010, this one is the worst for America.

Many will argue, Mr. Chairman, that we should not be taking this budget seriously because, after all, we have a short-term bipartisan agreement and that the Senate would never pass this budget, but I urge the country to take it seriously because what it tells America is what our Republican colleagues would do to the country if they had the power to do it.

If they could impose their will, this is the budget that they would impose, so we need to look hard at the consequences. What does it mean for America? What choices does the budget before us make for our country?

At its core, it rigs the rules of the game for very wealthy and very powerful special interests at the expense of everybody else in the country and at the expense of other priorities in the country.

For example, if you are a multi-millionaire, under this budget, you will have your top tax rate cut by one-third, all the way from 39 percent, where it is today, down to 25 percent. That is an average tax break for millionaires of \$200,000. That is great for people who are well off.

What does this budget do to the rest of this country? It guts vital investments in our children's future, it squeezes the middle class, and it violates important commitments to our seniors.

Now, let's step back because the chairman mentioned the economic ben-

efits of this budget. The reality is that our economic competitors around the world will eat our lunch if we pass this Republican budget. It provides for perverse tax incentives that ship American jobs overseas while shortchanging investments in jobs right here at home.

As we will see over the next couple of days, it guts important investments that historically have helped power our economy, and the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office tells us that, in the next couple of years, this is going to slow down economic growth, that it is going to slow down job growth. One estimate puts the job loss at 3 million jobs.

At a time when we need to be modernizing our national infrastructure—the backbone of our economy—this budget slashes the transportation budget by \$52 billion in this year alone, stopping new projects, throwing construction workers off the job.

It will condemn the United States to a potholed road of economic decline, and it refuses to include one thing that the Congressional Budget Office says will help boost our economy right now, which is to pass bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. Chairman, as this budget provides these windfall tax breaks for the folks at the very top, let's see what it does to others in our country.

We all depend on our kids getting a good education. It is good for families. It is good for the country. The saddest part about this budget is that it casts a dark shadow over the American Dream, and it violates the fundamental promise that every hardworking American should have a fair shot at success.

At a time when we should be investing more in education in the United States, all told, if you look at early education—K-12—and college education, this budget cuts it by \$370 billion below current services. That has devastating impacts on everything from Head Start to Early Head Start to K-12 to college.

Let me just mention one of the things it does to college student loans. It starts charging college students' interest while they are still in college, before they have gotten out and gotten a job. That saves \$40 billion in this budget—actually, a little more than that—in the same budget that provides huge tax breaks to the wealthiest in this country.

So much for wanting to address the lack of upward mobility in America; rung by rung, this budget knocks out the steps of that ladder of opportunity. If you are to the manor born, you are going to be just fine under this budget, but for everybody else, tough luck and worse.

Let's look at seniors as our next example. Those on Medicare will immediately pay more if they have high prescription drug costs, right? The chairman mentioned that the Democratic budget cut Medicare and turned it into something else.

The reality is that the savings that were achieved in Medicare by ending

some of the overpayments in the Democratic budget were recycled to strengthen key parts of Medicare, including to close what has been called the prescription drug doughnut hole.

The Republican budget here reopens the prescription drug doughnut hole. If you are a senior with high prescription drug costs, it is \$1,200 more per year, on average, as a result of this budget.

Seniors who have been able to get preventative health services without having to put down copayments will no longer get those screenings, and now, they will be at risk of not getting the treatment and care when they need it.

On top of all of that, it ends the Medicare guarantee by creating a voucher program. For seniors who decide to stay in the traditional Medicare program, they will see their premiums hiked by 50 percent when that goes into effect. They can stay, but they will have to pay big time to stay. That is not the Medicare guarantee.

Middle class families—I mentioned that this budget cuts the top tax rate for millionaires from 39 percent to 25 percent. That is a 30 percent tax cut, but it says it is going to do that in a deficit-neutral manner, so it is simple math, Mr. Chairman.

If you are going to do that, you are going to squeeze middle class taxpayers. In fact, this budget pretends that Chairman CAMP and the exercise he went through in the Ways and Means Committee—the fact-based exercise—never happened because what Chairman CAMP found was that you couldn't bring that top rate down to 25 percent without squeezing middle-income taxpayers.

That is why he had a top rate of 35 percent in his plan, and yet this says let's go to a 25 percent top rate. That means \$2,000 more in taxes for a family with kids to finance the tax breaks for the folks at the very top.

This budget reserves, perhaps, its cruelest blow for those who are seeking to climb out of poverty into the middle class, to have an opportunity to participate in the American Dream.

In the last election, the Republican candidate, Mitt Romney, said he really didn't care about the 47 percent. This Republican budget sets out to prove that statement. If you look at this budget, it is an assault on Americans who are struggling to climb out of the middle class.

We had a big debate in this Congress about food nutrition programs. The Republican plan called for \$40 billion in cuts. It ended up being \$8 billion. In this budget, it is \$137 billion.

Millions of more kids will go hungry as a result of cutting that safety net, and that is why faith-based groups that have looked at these Republican budgets over the last 3 years have said that they don't meet the tests of a society that cares for the least of these.

I want to close by asking a question because our Republican colleagues say the goal has to be 10 years to hit this political target. It is interesting be-

cause the Republican budget 3 years ago didn't balance until around 2040, but now, we have this sort of political target that they have to hit.

If it is so important to hit that, why do they ask everything of our kids and of our seniors and of struggling families and of nothing from very powerful special interests?

This budget does not close one special interest tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit, not one—not a special interest tax break for hedge fund owners, not a special tax break for big oil companies. We have a race to hit their political timetable here, but we are not going to ask those special interest groups to pay one dime to help reduce the deficit.

Here is the really strange thing: after all is said and done, this Republican budget does not balance in 10 years if, at the same time, the Republicans claim to be repealing the Affordable Care Act. It just doesn't add up. The math isn't there.

What this Republican budget does is this: it gets rid of all of the benefits in the Affordable Care Act. It gets rid of the tax credits that help Americans purchase affordable care. It gets rid of the provision that says you can stay on your parents' insurance policy until you are 26.

It gets rid of the provisions that say you cannot be denied coverage because you have a preexisting condition. It gets rid of all of the benefits.

Guess what it keeps? It keeps all of the tax revenue from the Affordable Care Act.

You don't have to take my word for it. This is The Heritage Foundation. This isn't some liberal group.

Here is what they say:

Perhaps the biggest shortcoming of this budget is that it keeps the tax increases associated with ObamaCare.

It is what they said about last year's budget. This year is exactly the same. This budget also keeps all of the savings from Medicare. It doesn't recycle any of those savings to strengthen it as the Democratic budget does, but it keeps them.

If you actually look at this chart, you will see that, in 2024, when the Republican budget claims to balance, without the revenues and the savings from Medicare, it doesn't come close to balancing.

So our Republican colleagues have got to choose. Either you claim to have a balanced budget and you recognize that you support all of the revenues and savings in the Affordable Care Act or not, but you can't have it both ways. The sad thing is, after hitting everybody but the very wealthy in this budget, they still can't achieve what they claim is their goal.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say: you can't have it both ways.

That is interesting. You can raid Medicare by \$716 billion to pay for

ObamaCare and then count that money as if it is going back to Medicare, counting the same dollar twice. That is not our word. That is the word of the Congressional Budget Office and of the actuaries, themselves, at Medicare, which is what the other side did with ObamaCare.

Look, apparently, the only way to revive and protect the American Dream is to bring our debt from \$17 trillion to \$24 trillion and, on the way there, raise taxes on hardworking Americans another \$1.8 trillion, and if you are not for that, you are against the American Dream.

□ 1545

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this budget because I believe it is the necessary fiscal path to secure our children's future. I hear from my constituents every time I go back home. We can't keep borrowing nearly 40 cents on every dollar we spend.

This budget is a commonsense blueprint that grows our economy. It will force Washington to live within its means by cutting \$5.1 trillion over 10 years to balance the budget. Under this plan, we will make much-needed reforms to the complicated and oversized Tax Code that will make Americans more competitive and create jobs. It will keep the promise to our seniors by strengthening Social Security and give our troops the tools they need to secure our country. This budget will provide relief from rising health care costs by repealing ObamaCare.

Families across my congressional district will be able to keep more of what they earn, which is exactly what we need to have happen to grow our economy. Right now, too many of them are struggling paycheck-to-paycheck under this Obama economy. Gas prices are still high and volatile. My constituents are paying higher health care premiums because of ObamaCare.

Families need a break, Mr. Chairman. This budget gives them a chance to get ahead while holding Washington accountable for its stewardship of your money.

Since we have a budget agreement, I am looking forward to seeing the Senate budget and when they will vote on it. I would encourage our friends on the other side of the aisle to keep HARRY REID's feet to the fire and make sure they do have a budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the ranking member for his extraordinary leadership and for developing a budget proposal that actually reflects our Nation's values and priorities.

Mr. Chairman, this Republican budget, offered by my colleague from Wisconsin, is another attempt to impose a

failed economic theory on the American people. This budget would damage economic growth in the short term and it disinvests in our future in the long term. It is absolutely the wrong course.

Millions of Americans continue to struggle to find work. Congress should be investing in priorities that will create jobs, priorities like education, rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure, and investing in advanced manufacturing and innovation that will help set the platform for a 21st century economy.

The Ryan Republican budget does exactly the opposite. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, compared to current law, the Ryan Republican budget would stifle our economic growth, reducing gross national product per capita by about 0.5 percent in each of the next 3 years.

Let that sink in. If you are searching for work or struggling to get by in this difficult economy, the message from this budget is clear: it is about to get a whole lot worse.

What could possibly be their rationale?

To my colleagues who say we need to make this sacrifice in the short term so we can experience long-term economic gains, they have it backwards. We need to invest in the short term to have long-term economic prosperity.

How does a budget that freezes Pell grants and slashes funding for higher education by approximately \$260 billion grow our economy in the long term?

Our Nation's infrastructure is the backbone of our economy and is essential to move goods and services in the short and long term. So how does a budget that cuts investments in transportation by \$52 billion next year alone help our economy?

How can you say a budget that singles out for elimination bipartisan programs like the Manufacturing Extension Partnership will boost our economy in the long term, a program that leverages Federal funding to provide small- and medium-sized manufacturers the capacity to grow, innovate, and prepare for a 21st century focus on advanced manufacturing? The answer is you can't.

Let's be clear: this budget cuts from today and disinvests from tomorrow. And for what purpose? To pay for another round of tax cuts for the wealthiest of Americans, amounting to about \$4 trillion in the next 10 years. But it is okay, they claim, because the benefits will trickle down to the middle class. This budget goes after Medicare, Medicaid, and nutrition programs for hungry children, all to pay for another round of tax cuts for the wealthy. This is immoral. And we know, from past experience, it is the wrong strategy for our economy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this budget because it will hurt jobs and inflict unnecessary pain on working families and our economy.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chair, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the

gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, in August of 2010, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs warned that the greatest threat to our national security was our national debt. That was \$4 trillion of debt ago. In fact, since the inauguration in 2009, we have accumulated more total government debt than we have run up from the very first day of the Washington administration through the third year of the George W. Bush administration.

We were told this would jump-start the economy. It hasn't. Instead, it has deprived markets of the capital that would otherwise be loaned to businesses seeking to expand jobs, to consumers seeking to make purchases, and to home buyers seeking to reenter the housing market.

I would remind the House that we cannot provide for the common defense or promote the general welfare if we cannot pay for them, and the ability of our government to do so is being slowly and surely destroyed by our debt. Balancing this budget and ultimately paying down the national debt is a national security imperative, it is an economic imperative, and it is a moral imperative.

Under Chairman RYAN's leadership, the House is about to pass the fourth budget in a row to balance. It stands in stark contrast to the President's budget that never balances and that condemns our Nation to a debt spiral that will consume our future. It reforms and reorganizes our social safety nets. It prevents their impending bankruptcy, and it restores them to financial sound foundations for the generations to come.

This is not beyond our ability. President Clinton, working in cooperation with a Republican Congress, delivered four balanced budgets in a row. Together, a Democratic President and a Republican Congress cut Federal spending by 4 percent of GDP. They enacted what amounted to the biggest capital gains tax cut in American history. They reformed entitlement spending by abolishing the open-ended welfare system. The economy blossomed.

In the years since, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, we have veered far from these policies of fiscal responsibility and economic expansion, and the economy languishes.

The budget before us combines the policies necessary not only to restore solvency to the government and save the social safety net, but it also restores prosperity to the American people. All we lack is the same cooperation from the President and the Senate that we had just two decades ago.

Time is not our ally. Every day we delay, the problem becomes more intractable and the road back becomes more difficult, protracted, and perilous.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just point out that I think it is useful to look at this through the perspective of history, because the last time we had balanced budgets in this country was at the end of the Clinton administration, and shortly after that, when President Bush came into office, we saw back-to-back tax cuts.

The theory at that time was if you dropped the top tax rate on high-income individuals, it will trickle down to everybody else and power-charge the economy. The only problem is that didn't work. It did not work at all. The trickle-down theory of economics did not work. We didn't get that boost of economic growth. What we did get was huge, huge deficits as far as the eye could see.

And so the problem with this budget is that it is a U-turn back to that philosophy—the idea that we are going to provide these tax cuts and it will create a big boost of economic activity. But reality has shown that it doesn't work that way. We should be building our economy from the middle out and from the bottom up. The top-down approach doesn't work.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this budget is worse than a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is like a Dracula in sheep's clothing coming in to suck the blood out of the middle class.

Under the false pretense of deficit reduction and a balanced budget, House Republicans have brought forth another attack on American seniors, students, workers, and middle class families, all the while protecting giveaways for the wealthy and corporations that ship jobs overseas.

This budget kills jobs at home by gutting critical investments in education and technological research and throws a wrench in the engine of American innovation. Instead of laying the foundation for innovation to create the new middle-class jobs of tomorrow or spur new technology, economic growth, and the next generation of entrepreneurs, this Republican budget uses fuzzy math and magic asterisks to hide its attack on the middle class.

This embarrassing budget is an excuse to assault the social safety net that has saved millions of Americans who fell off the economic ladder of opportunity during the Bush recession. Programs like food stamps, unemployment insurance, Medicaid, and job retraining are helping to get Americans back on their feet—Americans who lost their jobs and homes due to no fault of their own, but instead due to the fault of reckless Wall Street speculators. The victims include defenseless infants and dependent children, as well as the sick and the elderly.

The Republican budget uses these programs as punching bags for their

reckless agenda today to cut and gut. Republicans' relentless attacks on these programs will only hasten the descent and harden the fall of Americans who are already teetering on the brink.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans are playing their favorite game with the budget—hide and cut it. First, they hide behind budget gimmicks and magic asterisks, and then they cut unnamed programs that all magically fall only upon the backs of the poor, working families, seniors, and the middle class.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say, wow, that sounds horrible. Good thing it is not true. Only in Washington is a slower increase in spending awful, blood-curdling, cut-throating, terrible, and draconian cuts.

If we are going to get our fiscal house in order, what we are saying in this budget is, instead of increasing spending 5.2 percent a year on average, let's do it by 3.5 percent a year on average—hardly draconian.

And by the way, maybe people closer to the problems, like our States, might have a better idea on how to help people in their communities. Those are the principles we are talking about here.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), the chief deputy whip.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My home State is Illinois. The State of Illinois, Mr. Chairman, is a delightful place. It is the "Land of Lincoln" and the birthplace of Ronald Reagan, but it is a fiscal basket case. From a fiscal point of view, my home State is a national punch line, because one party—the other party—has dominated State government for years. For a decade, they have had the Governor's mansion. They have got majorities in both the Illinois House and the Illinois Senate.

And what has happened? It has been avoidance behavior, Mr. Chairman. An unwillingness to take on serious issues.

So what did the Democrats in Springfield, Illinois, do? They raised taxes. They didn't deal with the underlying fiscal problem.

And what was the net result? The budget gap didn't close, higher than average unemployment, and more per capita debt than nearly any other State in the Union on the taxpayers of Illinois.

□ 1600

All right. So what does that all that have to do with this?

Springfield, Illinois, is a foreshadowing, Mr. Chairman, of what not to do. Basically, we need to look at the fiscal situation in Springfield, Illinois, and look at it like a big, big traffic signal that says, don't come here; don't go this route; don't take this pathway. Instead, go another direction.

The direction that we need to go is the direction that the chairman has articulated, and that I think a majority is going to vote for tomorrow, and it is

a pathway that says, let's look clearly at these difficulties. Let's articulate them clearly. Let's be clear-eyed about what they are, and let's make decisions.

So what does this budget do?

The budget repeals ObamaCare and makes way for a patient-centered approach on health care that our constituencies are calling out for.

It says that we are going to empower States to make decisions. It says we are going to keep promises that are going to be made, not false promises, not telling folks that something is going to be there, and then just assuming that there is going to be some pixie dust that makes these problems go away.

No, these problems are going to be dealt with, and they are going to be dealt with in a forthright manner.

I think we are at an inflection point. I think the House is actually at an incredibly important stage right now, and we can go one of two pathways. One pathway we know, one pathway of more taxes, more spending, more avoidance, and not dealing with the underlying spending programs.

This is not theoretical, Mr. Chairman. The State of Illinois has tried that, and it is a mess. It is a mess that becomes worse. The longer the State waits, the worse the options are.

So what the chairman is saying is, let's not get to that point. We have got options. We have got time. We have got choices. We have got remedies, but we need to act now.

So I urge favorable consideration of this budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think, for the people who may be watching this, and for our colleagues, the question is, how do we achieve the priorities that we hope we all want to achieve, which is jobs growing faster, the economy growing faster, and deal with the long term deficit and debt in a responsible manner?

The glaring problem with the congressional Republican budget is that they don't call for any shared responsibility. They don't ask the most powerful special interests to contribute one dime by closing a single tax break, not one. And because they shelter the most powerful and the most wealthy, everybody else has to take a hit in their budget.

As a result, the entire country takes a hit because those are investments in our kids' education, in basic science and research that are important to help power our entire economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you to my friend from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) for yielding, and for his leadership.

He is exactly right. What this budget fails to do is address the fundamental questions that we have to address.

As a new member of the Budget Committee, during the most recent budget markup, I offered an amendment. A couple of dozen of our amendments were heard and dismissed rather quickly.

I offered an amendment that would deal with that question of shared sacrifice, an amendment that would have simply said that if you make more than \$1 million in this country, you should pay your fair share, applying the so-called Buffett Rule that basically says, if you are doing well, you should at least pay the same rate that another member of your staff would pay.

As Mr. Buffett pointed out, his secretary pays a higher rate. This would have required a 30 percent rate to apply to those folks making \$1 million.

What was interesting to me was what I was told by the other side, that this amendment was because people in the working middle class, people who go to work every day, are jealous of those who have done well in the United States.

Let me assure you, this has nothing to do with jealousy; it has everything to do with fairness. The only thing we ask is that if we are all going to pitch in to adopt a balanced budget and invest in growing our economy, we should all pitch in and not have a tax system that benefits the wealthiest, and has the rest of us not only have to pay more than our fair share, but not receive the important investments that will grow our economy.

So what this budget doesn't do is require we all pay a fair share. Neither does it extend unemployment insurance to those who are just trying to get from their last job to their next job without losing their house and their car and having their family split up.

It doesn't raise the minimum wage so that those who go to work every day won't live in poverty. It doesn't address the fundamental question facing us, and that is immigration reform, which would have a significant effect on growing our economy. People on the left and the right agree with that.

No, this statement of our collective values fails to address that fundamental question.

But what it does do is cut basic education. It would kick 170,000 kids out of Head Start, changing the trajectory of their lives forever; cuts \$89 billion out of education, \$35 billion alone out of Title I. Cuts higher education, which is an investment in our future, which we know pays dividends downstream. Cuts infrastructure.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. KILDEE. Cuts infrastructure, which we have to address. If our companies, if our manufacturers are going to be competitive, we are going to have to make those sorts of investment.

This budget does none of those things. All it does is protect those who

continue to be sheltered by a system that allows for this kind of inequality in this country and doesn't address the fundamental questions facing us.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I hope that my colleagues will join me in opposing this budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains between both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 72½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 68 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Thank you, Chairman RYAN.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Republican budget, which is a path to prosperity. It includes commonsense priorities and policies that will foster economic growth and job creation.

This is a plan to balance the budget in 10 years and begin to pay down the national debt, and this is exactly what our economy needs.

CBO says that, by reducing the deficit, our budget would promote economic growth. In stark contrast to budgets put forward by the President and by House Democrats, our budget will cut wasteful spending, rein in our national debt and, we hope, balance the budget. And the budget needs to be balanced. This would be done all without raising taxes on hardworking Americans.

It includes pro-growth policies that will harness domestic energy, restore patient-centered health care, strengthen retirement and the safety net programs that are so essential, and it will reform our Tax Code.

I thank my friend, Chairman RYAN, for putting forth a budget blueprint that addresses our Nation's long-term fiscal challenges truthfully and in a fiscally responsible manner.

Let me say that this blueprint spends \$43 trillion over the next 10 years. It reduces spending by \$5 trillion. Only in Washington can an increase annually of 3.5 percent be considered a cut. That is ridiculous.

At the rate we are going now, our spending would increase by 5.2 percent. We reform it to 3.5 percent annually over the next 10 years.

I applaud Chairman RYAN's hard work and courage, and look forward to an honest discussion here on the floor of the House.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just point out that we hear a lot about the global aggregate numbers, but the distribution of those cuts is important.

If you look at the portion of the budget that we have, historically, used to invest in education, to invest in innovation, to invest in places like the National Institutes of Health, that portion of the budget is cut by 24 percent relative to the bipartisan Ryan-Murray agreement. And it is cut from there.

So the part of the budget that does a lot of damage that we are focused on in terms of future investments, really does mean that we are going to be less competitive as a country. It will dull our competitive edge. And I will tell you, our economic competitors will be cheering.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the RYAN of the Ryan-Murray agreement, look, I wish that the Murray side of the agreement would have agreed to these out-year numbers. That didn't happen. That agreement is a 2-year agreement, so to compare this budget and the baseline against that of the 24 cut, that is not accurate.

Here is the problem, Mr. Chairman. We are spending money we don't have. We are going through the budget, program by program, line by line, and trying to reform these programs so that they can better deliver on their promises.

We are looking at certain programs, say, like food stamps, and saying, some States have some pretty innovative ideas on how better to deliver these services.

There have been some wasteful and fraudulent activities that needed to be gotten at so that we don't waste taxpayer money.

We think it is important to encourage able-bodied adults who do not have dependents to go to work. When we did that in welfare reform in the 1990s, it worked. People went to work.

By the way, child poverty dropped by double digits. Single moms went to work. It helped reduce poverty. We want to replicate that kind of success with these kind of reforms on these kinds of programs.

When they talk about education, this administration, and this Democratic budget, is making a bunch of empty promises. They are promising the world in Pell grants, but they are not funding that world.

We are saying, let's keep Pell and let's fund it, and let's keep it where it is, but let's fund it throughout the decade. I would rather take a full-funded promise than an empty promise any day. I think that is more honest with our students.

The other part I think we have to look at is, we are feeding tuition inflation. If we just keep pumping more and more borrowed money, empty-promised money into the system, what we are getting out of it is higher tuition.

Why don't we look at why tuition is going up so much in the first place?

Gosh, when we look at that, we are learning the Federal Government is part of the problem. Let's fix that.

Mr. Chairman, we do go through these things line by line.

The gentleman likes to talk about tax reform. What he won't tell you is specifically what this tax reform bill does, because we don't have a specific

tax reform in here because this is the budget.

The Ways and Means Committee does specific tax reform. That is where the loophole closers are.

We are saying the outline of it is to get tax rates down on businesses, small and large, so they can compete.

There are \$1 trillion in loopholes every year that they can work with to get those tax rates down. So to suggest that this, all of a sudden, does these tax breaks for millionaires and does this for these other people and does that, they are just making that stuff up.

What I think we ought to do is put the rhetoric aside and balance this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the chairman of the committee recognized that there are about \$1 trillion worth of tax expenditures. What does that mean?

That means tax preferences in the Tax Code. \$1 trillion a year, he said. That is right.

And yet, the Republican budget doesn't close one penny of those tax expenditures to help reduce our deficit, not one. It says we have to reserve all those tax loophole closures to cut the top rate for millionaires by one-third, from 39 percent to 25 percent. That is what they want to do with all the tax expenditures.

Because they refuse to get rid of one of those tax expenditures for the purposes of deficit reduction, their budget does hit all these students.

What is honest is to tell students who are going to college right now that this budget is going to charge them over \$40 billion more in interest because now they are going to have to pay interest while they are still in college, even though it doesn't close one of those tax expenditures for very wealthy people to help meet the targets and reduce the deficit, not one.

So, as we look at the priorities in this budget, we have to ask ourselves, why is it that this Republican budget doesn't call for any shared responsibility?

Why is it that it does provide tax breaks to folks at the very top at the expense of the rest of the country?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Yielding myself 15 seconds, the shared responsibility we are asking for is let's fix these problems within our generation and not pass it on to the next generation.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the policy chair of our conference.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, it was the basic principle that George Washington laid out in his farewell address, that every generation should

take care of the responsibilities of that generation, rather than pass it on to their child. It is a 200-year-old concept. It is fairly straightforward.

What is interesting to me is I have been in a personal conversation with our current President of the United States about debt and about balancing the budget. The conversation back and forth was circled around a simple principle: Bill Clinton and Newt Gingrich, two decades ago, made it their crowning achievement that they balanced the budget in a bipartisan time period.

My request to this President was: Can we agree that we should set a goal to balance the budget? His response to me was: No. Twenty years ago, that was a good idea, but now, the perception is that we should have sustainable deficits, that is, balance everything except for interest.

This year, our interest payment is \$233 billion. CBO forecasts that 10 years from now, our interest payment—single-year, one-year interest payment 10 years from now will be \$880 billion.

We must get us back to balance, and when I say balance, I mean real balance. Families balance their budget. Businesses balance their budget. States balance their budget.

We see times in our past when we had a balanced budget and saw the economic activity from that; but for whatever reason, now, we are just going to ignore that. Why? First off, it is because they will say it is hard. It is difficult to balance our budget. Well, I am sorry that it is hard.

This is what leaders do. We make difficult decisions to be able to get our Nation back on track for now and for the future.

The second thing is let's do a balanced approach. Let's raise taxes if we are going to reduce spending. Right now, this year, we have the highest amount of revenue in the history of the United States coming into the Federal Treasury.

Even with a down economy, this is the highest amount of revenue that has ever come into the Treasury, the second highest amount that has ever come into the Treasury, last year.

This is not an issue about not having enough tax revenue. We have the highest amount we have ever come into the Treasury. The issue is we are overspending. That is the key issue that we have got to get into.

The other argument that comes out is, you know what, there are no more efficiencies left. There is nowhere else left to cut in the Federal Government. Well, I have difficulty finding anyone outside of Washington that believes this government is running so efficient; there is no fraud, there is no waste, there are no inefficiencies in government, there is nowhere to cut.

When you walk through our budget, we are not trying to damage our economy. We are trying to protect our economy. We are trying to help grow and establish jobs that are happening by stabilizing the economy.

You go to businesspeople all over the country. They ask for one simple thing: give us a stable plan that gets us back onto balance, give us some stability in our economy, and we will grow our business.

Some predictability, that is what this budget is headed towards. It also is dealing with some simple things, like national defense. National defense is a prime—prime task of the Federal Government. This budget aggressively steps up and says we have a responsibility for national defense. We should maintain that.

The conversation about going to 10 carrier units around the world, 10 aircraft carriers may sound like a lot until you realize only two of them are in the ocean at any given time when you get down to 10.

When we get back up to 11, which is the established amount that we want to have, we can now have three out in our oceans. When you drop down that amount, you are making a decision that we are not going to have a presence somewhere in the ocean.

We have a stable peace when we are strong. It is a basic principle. If we weaken our military presence, we expose ourselves to weakness.

We need to be able to do this. We need to take out ObamaCare. We need to get us back into a stable economy. We need to deal with national defense. That is what this budget is all about.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me just point out to the gentleman that the President's budget has two things in it. First of all, it actually calls for a fund to increase defense spending for readiness in fiscal year 2015, which is not included in the Republican budget.

Number two, in the outyears, the President also grows our defense spending; and as the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense have testified, those investments will make sure that the United States is second to none.

In fact, the next 10 countries after that, together, spend much less on defense than the United States, and we will continue to have that additional robust defense spending to make sure that we are strong, but we also need to make sure that our economy is strong to support that kind of budget, and if you have got the important investments that have helped make the economy grow over time, you will not get that.

Now, I will just respond to the gentleman's comments on revenue. Anytime the economy is growing, if you have a certain tax rate, you are going to get more absolute dollars of revenue in, but I mentioned that the last time we had actually had a balanced budget in this country was in the year 1998 through 2001.

If you look at the amount of revenue that was coming in during that period as a percent of the economy, you will find that revenue was 19.2 percent in

1998, 19.2 percent in 1999, 19.9 percent in 2000, and so on, way ahead of the amount of revenue as a percentage of the economy that this Republican budget calls for in year 10, even though, between now and then, we will have millions more Americans on Medicare and Social Security.

So, again, they just can't bring themselves to close one of these special interest tax breaks, not one for the purpose of reducing the deficit and contributing to our economic well-being.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 2 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The first priority and responsibility of the Federal Government is to secure our Nation and to provide for the common defense of our Nation.

The gentleman from Maryland mentioned the President has this proposal for this year that would have violated our bipartisan budget agreement. It is a proposal that holds hostage defense for higher taxes and more domestic spending, but worse than that, we had a hearing in the Budget Committee about 2 years ago.

Then-Secretary of Defense Panetta, along with the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, came and testified; and they said to our Budget Committee: This is as far as we can go, we can't cut any further without doing damage to our military.

That is effectively where the Republican budget is. That is not where this year's Obama budget is. The President's budget, which is also replicated by the Democratic substitute, cuts the military far lower than that. They are bringing the Army and the Marines to a level we have not seen since before World War II. They are shrinking our Navy to a size we have not seen since before World War I. They are shrinking our Air Force to a level we have never seen before.

They are cutting compensation for our men and women in uniform, not to save money for other parts of the military, like readiness and training and equipment, but they are cutting compensation, cutting force structure, cutting personnel, cutting equipment, cutting defense—not to reduce the deficit, but to spend it on more domestic spending.

The Joint Chiefs have said that now, with this budget submission, it represents a moderate risk of actually affecting our national security. They have never said that before. They have said we have had a low risk.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 15 more seconds to say, of all the problems that we have in the President's budget, it hollows out our military, sends the wrong signals overseas, and we are not going to do that.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, the distinguished vice chair of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by commending the

chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, for his wonderful and positive work on real solutions. When I go back home and I talk to folks, they say: Well, don't y'all have any solutions that will actually work?

That is what this is. This is a real solution, a commonsense solution. My constituents back home in the Sixth District of Georgia also tell me that they are saddened and disheartened by the comments that we hear from the other side, primarily, on dividing Americans, pitting one American against another.

It really is a cynical ploy. It may be politically opportune, but it is not helpful. It is not helpful for the discourse that we have in this country. It is not helpful for us reaching those real solutions; so I implore my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: let's get together and work together and find those real solutions.

What my constituents back home also tell me is that the path we are on just isn't working. The economy is not thriving; record deficits continue. I mentioned the mantra of division that seems to be the MO of the other side, but the other side, the Democrats, seem to be happy with all this.

They seem to be happy with an economy that is not thriving. They seem to be happy with an economy that has resulted in fewer Americans working. They seem to be happy with fewer success stories across this country.

They seem to be happy that more jobs are leaving the country, as opposed to being created here. They seem to be happy with higher and higher taxes and more and more spending. They seem to be happy with borrowing more money from foreign countries. They seem to be happy with compromising opportunities for future generations.

We believe that there is a better way, that there are positive solutions and real solutions, and that is our budget—a responsible, balanced budget; yes, a balanced budget, a path to prosperity for every single American.

We have had a little discussion over the past few minutes about defense. I want to talk about some specific issues in our budget, defense being one of them. This is a very dangerous world.

Our budget recognizes that. It realizes the danger that we have and that our allies have, and we increase spending for defense and for national security. We account for that in our budget in a positive way.

The President, irresponsibly, seems to bury his head in the sand. His budget, as has been mentioned, puts us back at pre-World War II levels for our men and women in uniform. That is not consistent with what the American people see in the real world right now, so what we do is account for that and increase defense spending in a responsible way.

In the area of health care, I am a physician. I recognize that the world of health care is in an upheaval. There

are physicians leaving their practices. There are seniors who are losing their doctors. There are new Medicare patients who are unable to find physicians.

In fact, the actuaries of Medicare—not Republican or Democrat—but the actuaries of the Medicare system have said that the system is going broke. Within a 10-year period of time, it will not be able to provide the services for seniors that have currently been promised.

Our budget positively addresses these issues. We save and strengthen and secure Medicare. How? With positive reforms; putting patients in charge, not government in charge.

In fact, the proposal that we outlined a number of years ago and continue to include in our budget right now, the premium support for seniors, making it so that they have more choices, the Congressional Budget Office did a study on that exact program published last September.

They recognize that this program that is proposed by the Republicans will not only save money for seniors, but it will save money for taxpayers—real positive solutions. Again, it will put patients in charge and not government.

Another exciting difference between our proposal, our budget, real solutions and the other side, is that we understand that a growing economy is essential to getting us back on the right track. The past 5 years have certainly not been helpful.

The Congressional Budget Office, once again, has evaluated our proposed policies and has said that, if we are able to get our economy back on the right track by instituting our plan of saving over \$5 trillion, that there would be significant benefits to the economy.

Realistic scoring shows that—and I will quote from the Congressional Budget Office—“CBO finds that reducing budget deficits is a net positive for economic growth. Deficit reduction creates long-term economic benefits because it increases the pool of national savings and boosts investment, thereby raising economic growth and job creation. These benefits are both significant and lasting.”

That is our budget, positive growth in the economy and significant and lasting benefits to the American people.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDING). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Finally, I want to just mention briefly the issue of the debt. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, said just a few years ago that the number one threat to our national security is not the threats that we see from other nations and rogue regimes, it is the threat of our national debt. The American people know this.

We are over \$17 trillion in debt, and the President continues to spend, in his

budget, record deficits—record annual deficits. The Path to Prosperity, the plan that we are proposing, gets us back on the right track, gets us on a path to balance, balancing within a 10-year period of time, and on trajectory to pay off the entire debt of the United States of America, thereby increasing economic opportunity and viability and all.

□ 1630

We are for the greatest amount of success for the greatest number of Americans and the greatest number of American Dreams being realized. The way that you do that is through the Path to Prosperity, a balanced and responsible budget.

I urge my colleagues to support this balanced budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would just note that it is this Republican budget here in the House of Representatives that divides America. And when we point out that this is a budget that protects tax breaks for the very wealthy at the expense of everybody else, our colleagues say, oh, no, no, that is dividing America. But what we are explaining is the Republican budget, and that is, unfortunately, what it does.

The chairman originally said that only in Washington is an increase really a cut. I would just point out that in the President's defense budget, it goes from \$521 billion in fiscal year 2015 to \$646 billion 10 years from now—hardly a cut, in fact, quite an expansion going forward.

I am now pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), a distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee who has focused a lot on defense.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Ranking Member VAN HOLLEN, for all of your work on this.

Mr. Chair, there are many damaging cuts in this budget, but I would like to speak just a minute about the cuts to education. In ancient civilizations, literacy and education were closed off to all but the very affluent; and the beauty of America, since its founding, has been the democratization of a way to become educated, make your way into the middle class and to do well.

This budget would threaten that, and it does it in several ways. First, it cuts Pell grants, that is, grants to college students, by \$145 billion. It also very significantly makes Pell grant aid unavailable to part-time students.

I want to focus on that for just a second because this is something we see over and over in our districts again: single moms or working parents, men or women, who are trying to balance a job and go to school at the same time. They are trying to take two or three classes maybe, make their way, still be able to work to support their families, but also go to college and finish off and slowly get their degree.

This budget would not allow them to access Pell grants. It would make

achieving their goal of getting their education, maybe training for another kind of job, impossible for millions of Americans. The cuts to Pell grants are especially significant because in States like mine, in Texas, since 2003, tuition has gone up an average of 104 percent for thousands and thousands of Texans.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. So when Republicans put forward a budget that cuts off access to higher education, what they are doing is cutting off a path to the middle class for millions of Americans, and every American, young and old, should be concerned about that.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now am very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a terrific member of the Budget Committee who is focused on lots of important issues including the challenge of poverty in America.

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for your tremendous support and leadership on behalf of the majority of the American people in our country.

Mr. Chair, I rise, of course, in strong opposition to this very reckless Republican budget. This is yet another Republican messaging document masquerading really as a budget resolution. Once again, Republicans have brought forth a budget that slashes the programs that keep the poorest and most vulnerable Americans healthy, working, and with food on the table.

Under this cruel plan—and, yes, it is a cruel plan—seniors on Medicare would see their payments for services and prescriptions skyrocket. We would see an end to the Medicare guarantee as we know it.

By converting SNAP to a block grant program, Republicans, once again, seek to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable by cutting our Nation's first line of defense, and that is hunger. Between cuts and policy changes, this budget would cut \$137 billion in SNAP benefits over 10 years—\$40 billion wasn't enough.

And at the same time that our Nation is facing the greatest income inequality since the Great Depression, this Republican budget would protect some of the most outrageous tax breaks and loopholes for the wealthiest millionaires, billionaires, and Big Oil companies. That is right. Once again, this plan really wreaks havoc on the poor and the middle class, who really pay the price so that my colleagues across the aisle can claim a balanced budget.

Sadly, it does not stop there. While the Republican budget continues to keep the American Dream out of reach for the poor, it would increase spending, mind you, for the already bloated Pentagon budget and continue the

Overseas Contingency Operations slush fund, which is really paying for wars hopefully in the future that won't exist. We simply cannot continue to write a blank check for spending on war if we are to ever have a chance of getting our fiscal house in order.

We can't do this to America's struggling families and the working poor. Republicans claim they want to eliminate poverty, and, yes, we are holding this debate. Finally, it has become a national debate. We are debating poverty and how to make sure people find pathways out of poverty. Yet just read this budget. It is a pathway into poverty.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentle lady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Yes, I said a pathway. And thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, because we have looked at this budget and looked at how it will create more poverty. So it is a pathway into poverty.

Budgets are moral documents. They reflect our values. So the underlying values in the Ryan budget really do not reflect who we are as Americans, believing that we really are our brothers' keepers and we really are our sisters' keepers.

So I urge Members to reject this Republican budget and instead support the budget proposals presented by the Democratic Caucus, the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and the Congressional Black Caucus. We need a budget that puts Americans back to work.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from California has again expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentle lady an additional 10 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. I just want to conclude by saying we need a budget, and all three of the budgets that I just mentioned put Americans back to work. They invest in our future, they protect the safety net, and they work to reignite the American Dream for all. This budget does just the opposite. So I hope that all of us will vote "no" on the Ryan budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say there are different visions. We don't think we should take more money from hardworking taxpayers to spend it in Washington and then borrow more from our children. We think we should balance the budget and pay off the debt.

We are going to see a lot of budgets coming to the floor here offered by the other side, which is great. It is their right. I am glad they are offering alternatives.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN's Democratic budget will have a \$1.8 trillion tax increase, just like the President's new \$1.8 trillion tax increase. The Progressive Caucus budget, they have the candle here: a \$6.6 trillion tax increase they are encouraging.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

Spending by the other side, what they are saying is let's just have a bidding war on how much we can raise people's taxes. Let's even raise spending more. And nobody else is offering a budget that will ever balance the budget. So the idea here is borrow endlessly, never balance it, and give our children an inferior standard of living.

With that, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman RYAN for yielding, but, more importantly, thank him for his work and leadership in this area.

Tonight around America, families will sit down at the kitchen table to talk about their family finances. And there always seem to be more needs than there are dollars in a paycheck. So those families will sit down. They may shed tears tonight, and they may have some tense words between them, but before the night is over, they will sit down and make tough decisions about how they will spend their family's budget.

Just last week, the State legislature in my State adjourned, but before they did, they made some tough choices. They weren't able to fund everything they wanted to fund, and they had to set priorities. Local governments and county governments are making tough choices.

When it comes to American families sitting around their kitchen table, if the State legislature, if city governments and county governments are making those tough choices, they have every reason to expect their government in Washington to do the same thing. And for 4 years now, under the leadership of Chairman RYAN, we have put forward a budget that does make these tough but necessary decisions about getting control of our Federal spending.

That is why I am proud to join my colleagues and vote for a budget that responsibly cuts \$5.1 trillion over the next 10 years by reforming the main drivers of our debt—targeting wasteful spending. At the same time, this budget seeks to expand opportunity to help the private sector create jobs by highlighting policies that will grow the economy.

Meanwhile, the administration wants to take more money out of the paychecks of hardworking Americans by raising their taxes, wants to spend more money, and wants to borrow more money from successive generations and never balance the budget.

This administration has made all sorts of promises it can't keep. For example, the Congressional Budget Office says that Pell grants will begin to have a shortfall in 2016 and every year thereafter. Medicare? My mom and dad

worked all of their life, paid into a program, and their government made them a promise. They said that, when you get to retirement age, we are going to provide you health care; yet the actuarial models say that program is going bankrupt, and the administration doesn't deal with it.

This budget does make tough decisions and makes tough choices. And the critics? They call this budget draconian. Only in Washington is making a tough choice labeled as being controversial.

It is important that we make these decisions and put our government back on a path of sustainable finances to grow our economy. By making these tough choices, we ensure our children and our grandchildren a better future because we are doing more than just balancing a budget. We are living out the American Dream. Beating in the heart of every American since this country was founded is the desire to leave a better way of life to successive generations, not saddle those generations with massive amounts of debt.

So, for those reasons, I support this budget, and I urge my colleagues to support this budget, as well.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman referred to tough decisions. Well, it is true that the House Republican budget is really tough on our kids' education. It cuts deeply into early education, Early Head Start, and Head Start. It cuts very deeply into K-12. That includes Title I and special education for kids with disabilities. As we have talked about, it charges college students higher interest rates.

And it is true that the Republican budget is tough on seniors on Medicare, because if they have high prescription drug costs, the Republican budget reopens the doughnut hole so they will face \$1,200 more per year on prescription drugs.

So it is tough on kids' education, and it is tough on seniors.

I will tell you who it is not tough on. It is not tough on powerful special interests, people who are spending millions of dollars right now on TV advertising trying to influence people's votes. It is not tough on them at all. As I said, this budget calls for cutting the top tax rate by, fully, 30 percent.

Now, during the Budget Committee debate, the Democrats said, okay, the only way you can do this mathematically, if you are cutting the top rate by 30 percent, from 39 percent to 25 percent, is if you do it in a deficit neutral way, then you are going to be increasing taxes on middle class taxpayers and families to finance those tax cuts. And so we said to our Republican colleagues, if that is not what you intend to do, let's at least pass an amendment telling the Ways and Means Committee that one of our principles is at least maintaining the current progressivity of the Tax Code so we don't increase taxes on middle class families or lower-income families to finance the tax breaks for the folks at the top, called

the Protect the American Middle Class from a Tax Increase amendment.

□ 1645

Republicans said no to that.

They have got all sorts of other instructions to the Ways and Means Committee in their budget, like reducing the top rate by a third for millionaires; but when it came to instructing the Ways and Means Committee not to increase the tax burden on middle class Americans, they said no to that.

So, yes, this Republican budget is tough on the middle class. It is tough on seniors, and it is tough on our kid's education; but for folks at the very top, they just don't ask for any shared sacrifice. We are just pointing that out. It is a fact in their budget.

The chairman talked about all those tax expenditures, \$1 trillion a year worth. Not one of those tax expenditures are closed for the purpose of reducing the deficit.

Now, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), a Member of Congress who has worked hard throughout his entire career to try and make sure that our country grows and that every American has opportunity, the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have a choice to make. The House Democratic budget and the Republican's budget present very different choices about America's future. The Democratic alternative promotes job growth and expands opportunity. The Republican budget gives away trillions to the wealthy and special interests, while shredding the social safety net.

The Affordable Care Act is the most significant expansion of health coverage in 50 years. It ends discrimination based on preexisting conditions. It promotes health and prevention. It improves quality and lowers cost.

The Republican budget repeals the Affordable Care Act. Over 10 million Americans will lose coverage immediately. Insurers could discriminate based on preexisting conditions. More than 8 million seniors who have saved more than \$10 billion on prescription drugs and more than 32 million who have benefited from free preventive services would immediately see higher costs. The 129 million Americans with preexisting conditions would no longer be safe from discrimination.

After they repealed the Affordable Care Act, the Republican budget would slash Medicaid by a full 25 percent. This will hurt millions of seniors in nursing homes, millions of low-income babies whose mothers receive important prenatal care, and millions of people with disabilities. These are immoral and outrageous cuts.

The Republican budget also ends the Medicare guarantee, forcing seniors who stay in fee-for-service to pay more for the coverage they have today. It slashes key domestic spending, cutting biomedical research, key job creation programs, and programs that keep kids

from going hungry, just to name a few examples. Are these responsible choices? I don't think that is the path we ought to take.

The Democratic alternative is fiscally responsible and good for our Nation's health. I urge my colleagues to reject the House Republican approach and, instead, support working families, seniors, and people with disabilities by protecting our health care system from these attacks.

I urge a "no" vote on the Republican budget. Vote support for the Democratic budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chair, at this time, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your leadership.

As a member of the Budget Committee and the Armed Services Committee, I am proud to support a balanced budget that stops spending money we don't have. It provides regulatory relief and promotes for a strong defense.

Our Federal debt tops an astonishing \$17 trillion. This is unacceptable. It is irresponsible to take more money from hard-working families just to spend more here in Washington.

Our Path to Prosperity budget balances in 10 years by cutting wasteful spending and reforming government. Just as importantly, this budget gets our priorities right again by providing for the common defense. It replaces \$274 billion in scheduled defense cuts to ensure the American people have a bright, safe future.

It is imperative we do so because, since taking office, President Obama has directed over \$1 trillion in cuts to our military. Under the President's budget, which cuts \$75 billion over the next 2 years, with deeper cuts expected if sequestration returns in fiscal year 2016, Secretary of Defense Hagel and other senior defense and military officials acknowledge that these budget choices will create additional risk to our Nation. We can't allow this to happen.

While we cut nearly one-fifth of our defense resources, Russia and China are arming at an alarming rate. Russia's military spending is up roughly 30 percent, and China's has more than doubled in recent years.

Given our military shortfalls, we must build upon the recent compromise and further reverse the current trajectory to mitigate the permanent damage to our national security.

I am proud to support a balanced budget that reins in government spending, promotes job creation, and reprioritizes our national defense. Our Path to Prosperity budget accomplishes these goals.

We cannot keep going to the Department of Defense to cut spending. We must deal with the real drivers of our debt and put our country on a sustainable path to grow the economy. America's future depends on it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it is now my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a fighter for working Americans and a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago, the gentleman from Mississippi said that families were sitting around at their kitchen table. Yes, they are sitting at their kitchen table, and they are crying.

They do not have a job. Their unemployment benefits have not been extended. Their wages have stagnated. They can't afford to send their children to college; and this majority fiddles while Rome burns and refuses to address any of these issues, but they certainly make it easy to lower the top tax rate for the richest Americans.

I rise in strong opposition to this cruel budget proposal; yet again, the House majority has put forward an ideological plan that puts all of the burdens on the most vulnerable among us, especially women and families.

Today is Equal Pay Day, a day that women's earnings finally catch up to what men made in 2013, but the fact is this dubious milestone, that it even exists, is a sad testament to the financial pressures that women and families face.

This budget proposal puts more pressure on women and families. Two-thirds of seniors in poverty are women. They rely on the bedrock American institution of Medicare to survive. This budget ends Medicare as we know it. It turns it into a voucher program. Seven in 10 elderly individuals, six in 10 non-elderly individuals rely on Medicaid, they are women.

The budget proposes \$2.7 trillion in cuts to Medicaid and other support that help low- and middle-income families buy health insurance.

WIC provides critical food benefits to 8.3 million pregnant postpartum women, infants, and children across America. The budget drastically slashes the program, hurting the same family struggling the most in this economy.

It devastates food stamps, the program in which almost two-thirds of the adult participants are women and children, and they account for nearly half of all recipients.

It cuts 170,000 kids from Head Start, educational services for 3.4 million disadvantaged children. It cuts the Pell grant by over \$125 billion. It allows the insurance companies to, once again, charge women more than men.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, it cuts Pell grants, and yet it allows insurance companies to, once again, charge women more than men and to treat pregnancy as a preexisting condition.

According to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, 69 percent of the

cuts in the Republican budget would come from programs serving low- and moderate-income people. This Ryan Republican budget is not a reflection of America's values. It is not who we are as a country. It is an ideological document that threatens American families.

I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert into the RECORD a very specific recitation of the Center for Budget Priorities' claim that the gentlewoman mentioned, and at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

RESPONSIBLE SPENDING RESTRAINT AND REFORM—RESPONSE TO THE CENTER ON BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES

In Brief:

A smaller increase is not a spending cut.

Under this budget, spending will grow, on average, by 3.5 percent a year over the next decade—on the current path, it will grow by 5.2 percent.

This budget spends \$3.5 trillion on Medicaid over the next ten years. We increase spending every year from fiscal year 2016 onward.

This budget spends \$600 billion on food stamps over the next decade. And it does not convert SNAP into a block grant until 2019, when the economy will have recovered.

This budget maintains the current maximum Pell award (\$5,730) throughout each of the next ten years of the budget.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities claims the House Republican budget "gets 69 percent of its cuts from low-income programs." Instead, the House GOP budget grows them at a more sustainable rate.

On the current path, the federal government will spend roughly \$48 trillion over the next ten years. By contrast, this budget will spend nearly \$43 trillion.

On the current path, spending will grow, on average, by 5.2 percent a year over the next decade. Under this budget, spending will grow, on average, by 3.5 percent a year.

Nearly \$43 trillion is enough. Increasing spending by 3.5 percent instead of 5.2 percent is hardly draconian.

President Obama and his party have made promises they can't keep—they've promised huge expansions to safety-net programs that ultimately would bankrupt them.

Medicaid: This budget repeals Obamacare—including the law's massive expansions of Medicaid, which are unsustainable. Instead, this budget spends \$3.5 trillion on Medicaid over the next ten years. We grow the program every year from fiscal year 2016 onward. We simply slow the rate of growth and give states the flexibility to meet the unique needs of their people.

SNAP: This budget spends \$600 billion on food stamps over the next decade. By capping open-ended federal subsidies and allowing states to develop new, innovative methods, the budget's gradual reforms encourage states to reduce rolls and help recipients find work. The budget also doesn't convert SNAP into a block grant until 2019, when the economy will have fully recovered. The budget also calls for time limits and work requirements like the reforms that helped reduce poverty nationwide in the mid-1990s.

Pell Grants: Congressional Democrats and the President have pushed Pell Grant spending to unsustainable rates. The Congressional Budget Office reports the program will face fiscal shortfalls starting in 2016 and continuing through each year of the budget

window. We need to reform the program so it can keep its promises. This budget brings Pell spending under control and makes sure aid helps the truly needy, not university administrators. At the same time, this budget maintains the current maximum Pell award (\$5,730) throughout each of the next ten years of the budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the House Republican budget plan. Unlike the President's budget, this is a serious proposal that balances our budget and helps our economy grow.

Our Nation is \$17.4 trillion in debt. If we want to preserve this country for our children and our grandchildren, we must reform the way Washington works.

Everyone knows that Medicare will soon go bankrupt, and that is why I am so happy that this budget proposal saves this important program for our seniors and future generations. By transitioning to a premium support model, we can preserve Medicare for those in or near retirement and strengthen Medicare for younger generations.

Furthermore, this budget ends ObamaCare's raid on the Medicare trust fund and repeals ObamaCare's Independent Payment Advisory Board to help ensure our seniors get the care they deserve.

Despite what some critics say, this does not eliminate traditional Medicare. Instead, it ensures that Americans will always have traditional Medicare as an option. Under this plan, every senior will have the support they need to get the care they deserve. Those who attack this reform without offering credible alternatives are complicit in Medicare's demise.

So I want to commend Chairman RYAN and my Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee for leading, where President Obama and the Senate Democrats have failed. One way or another, this country will have to address our out-of-control debt and deficits, and this budget does so responsibly.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it is now my privilege to yield 4 minutes to a fellow Marylander, Mr. HOYER, the Democratic whip, who has spent a lot of time focused on budgets to empower our economy and to make sure we do so in a fiscally responsible manner.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

I would first observe, Mr. Chairman, that the American people ought to lament another opportunity missed, an opportunity to come together and adopt a big, balanced plan for investment and balance in our fiscal system in America.

Mr. Chairman, last year, we adopted a budget. During the course of its implementation with the consideration of appropriation bills, the Republican chairman of the committee called the sequester numbers adopted in the 2014 Ryan plan unrealistic and ill-conceived.

For 2016 through 2024, Mr. Chairman, this budget has numbers below sequester levels that the chairman said were unrealistic and ill-conceived.

Chairman ROGERS has called the numbers in this budget draconian, Chairman ROGERS, responsible for funding the operations of government and assisting and building our economy and its people.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is all that and a call to disinvestment. This budget is a call to disinvestment in America's growth and success.

We have heard a lot of claims, of course, about what the Republican budget will do for our country. I have heard those claims from previous Republican chairmen, frankly. They did not pan out.

Let me clear that fog away and get down to the raw numbers which reveal the magnitude of the damage the Republican budget will inflict. As a matter of fact, with all due respect, I call it a retreat—an alliterative retreat of course, the chairman's retreat.

First, the Republican budget would repeal the patient protections and other benefits of the Affordable Care Act, leaving millions without health insurance coverage.

Of course, it keeps the money; it just didn't give the benefits. It would turn Medicaid into a capped block grant program and cut its funding by \$732 billion over the next decade.

□ 1700

That is from seniors who need long-term care. That is from people with disabilities who need medical services.

Two-thirds of Medicaid spending goes to low-income seniors, and the Republican budget cuts it by a quarter.

It would also end the Medicare guarantee and reopen the doughnut hole for prescription drugs, shifting costs back to seniors.

Secondly, the Republican budget disinvests, as I said, from many of the very important initiatives Congress has made a priority for the future growth and competitiveness of our economy.

It cuts over \$120 billion from middle class college affordability programs like the Pell grant and will leave a college undergraduate taking out a student loan as much as \$3,800 deeper in debt.

By eliminating funding for applied research, their budget will reduce Federal research grants by half—by half disinvestment. It could result in 2,400 fewer National Science Foundation research awards and 1,400 fewer National Institutes of Health awards.

The reality is, Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget would decimate pediatric research. We have heard a little bit about that. It would decimate pediatric research. It would decimate all other research as well and other medical research in the lifesaving diseases by billions of dollars, not just pediatric research: cancer, heart, lung, blood, Alzheimer's, and others. \$173 billion

will be cut from highway spending over the next 10 years, disinvestment, even though infrastructure investments are critical to the growth of our manufacturing sector and job creation.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. Overall, the Republican budget reduces our long-term investments in education, research, infrastructure, and job training by over 15 percent over the next decade compared to the deal the Republican chairman negotiated just 4 months ago.

I will tell you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member, our competitors around the world are not retreating in terms of investments. Perhaps the most egregious mark against this budget, though, is that it does not achieve the fiscal balance its authors give as the reason for these cuts in the first place.

Instead, it relies on "dynamic scoring." That is, pretend something will happen. Now, if it happens, we would have a bonus and we could use that bonus. But if it doesn't happen, this budget will guarantee that we will be further in the hole.

It has an asterisk for \$966 billion. It doesn't say what that \$966 billion is about, at least two-thirds of it. But you guess, pretend, hope. If it doesn't happen, you are in the hole.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. This budget, Mr. Chairman, is a blueprint for economic decline, for vulnerable Americans being left to fend for themselves, and for an America less equipped to protect its citizens.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution and send a message that our country will continue to invest in its priorities: opportunity, security, and growth. Let us not retreat. Let us serve this country and serve its greatness.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I want to rest the mind of the distinguished minority whip at ease. Chairman ROGERS does support this budget. His comments in 2013 aside, he is a supporter of this budget. This budget balances using CBO numbers.

I would also say this. All these complaints about spending cuts or slower increases in spending aside—this budget, by the way, doesn't specify that NIH is going to have all of that—all of these reductions in spending or reductions in the increase in spending will pale in comparison if we have a debt crisis, if we have a bond market incident, if we have an interest rate shock.

If we keep kicking the can down the road, the solution then will be so much uglier, so much more draconian, than any of this hyperbolic rhetoric even suggests.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the House Republican budget.

Today, our national debt exceeds \$17.5 trillion. Mr. Chairman, that is a blueprint for decline—more than \$55,000 for every man, woman, and child in America. If we fail to address this mounting debt now, our children and our grandchildren will inherit an America that will be poorer, less free, and provide fewer opportunities.

To address this looming crisis, Republicans propose balancing the Federal budget in 10 years. Most Americans don't realize that discretionary spending has decreased 4 consecutive years, a tremendous accomplishment spurred on by House Republicans.

Now we must show the same resolve to tackle our largest drivers of debt, mandatory programs, including Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and SNAP. We can achieve balance without reducing overall spending—let me say that again—we can achieve balance without reducing overall spending by simply slowing the rate of growth at which spending increases. We must spend hardworking taxpayer dollars smarter.

Mr. Chairman, I am Medicare age, and I realize that for every dollar that we pay in in premiums, we get \$3 out in benefits. This is clearly not sustainable.

As a physician, I would like to commend Chairman RYAN for his continued efforts to save and strengthen Medicare. We must act to protect seniors' access to medical care before the Medicare trust fund becomes insolvent in 2026, a short time from now.

This proposal achieves that goal while ensuring those Americans 55 and older experience absolutely no change.

I urge my colleagues to support this very conservative budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, to create jobs and grow our economy, we must work toward lasting solutions that put our Nation back on solid fiscal ground, stop wasteful Washington spending, and balance our budget.

The American people deserve more accountability from Washington, and Washington has a responsibility to the American people to produce, number one, a budget, and, number two, a budget that balances. Anything less than that is a failure to lead.

That is why I introduced the Balanced Budget Accountability Act, which requires Congress to pass a balanced budget or Members won't get paid. The principles found in my Balanced Budget Accountability Act reflect Montana commonsense, and they stand in stark contrast with the President's budget, which never achieves

balance, and the Senate, where Democrat leaders have decided the American people don't deserve a budget at all. That is irresponsible and will only lead to never-ending deficits and a debt that will take generations to pay off. That is not the Montana way, that is not the American way.

I don't agree with everything in this budget, but I know that the people of Montana want and deserve a solution to our debt crisis, a balanced budget, and a Congress with the courage to lead.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding me time.

As I am sitting on the floor listening to the back and forth and the division, I was thinking back to a time when there was consensus in this body on important investments for our future.

Indeed, the character of our Nation, our economic vitality, was grounded in the investment the United States made in our ports, our railroads, our highways. The finest infrastructure in the world gave the United States the strength to be victorious in battle in World War I and World War II, to have the economic strength to be able to meet national challenges, and to provide economic security and well-being for our families.

Unfortunately, as families struggle, as we have difficulty providing family-wage jobs for American workers, the American infrastructure is no longer the envy of the world, as it was in the past. In fact, all the independent studies show we are not anywhere near the top of the pack. We fall into the lower ranges of the development world.

The American Society of Civil Engineers has given our infrastructure a grade of D-plus and suggests we will need to invest over \$3 trillion over the next 6 years just to remain economically competitive in the global marketplace. The failure to deal with our infrastructure is going to cost American families in terms of wear and tear on their vehicles over \$1,000 a year and millions of hours stuck in traffic in congestion.

We are facing a soon-to-be-bankrupt highway trust fund. The clock is ticking. By the end of September, it will run out of money, which means we are seeing cutbacks on Federal contracts this summer, which means some States are having to act now this spring. The decision of Tennessee this last week—it is the 11th State that has announced cutbacks.

The Republican budget being debated today ignores this pending crisis, let alone the growing needs of American communities. Their budget would freeze us in decline, a 30 percent reduction over the next decade from already inadequate levels, making it impos-

sible to deal with projects of national significance and severely straining ongoing maintenance of our highway and transit systems.

It doesn't have to be this way. A broad and powerful coalition ranging from the AFL-CIO to the Chamber of Congress, the trucking association, AAA, bicyclists, environmentalists, local governments, contractors, businesses large and small have joined with a group of 17 bipartisan governors and the heads of 31 State chambers of commerce to urge that Congress face this funding crisis so that we can have a full 6-year reauthorization so that we can put hundreds of thousands of Americans to work, strengthen the economy, and protect our communities.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Instead of wasting more time on a budget that is going nowhere, we should come together to address our failing bridges, roads, and water system. Our future demands it, our constituents expect no less.

I strongly urge the rejection of the Republican budget if for no other reason than it freezes us in this decline for infrastructure and look forward to the day when we will work together to solve this problem.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 40 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 41½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Does the chairman have any further speakers?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I do not have any further speakers at the moment.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair and ranking member of our Budget Committee for the opportunity to share some thoughts.

Mixed messaging—it really grips the American public. Washington Republicans are presenting their budget and proclaiming that we are about reducing the debt and reducing the deficit. We are concerned about our children, we are concerned about our grandchildren.

At the same time, the mixed message is to the crowd that is above a million dollar threshold, income threshold: We have money for you we are going to spend for you. We are so concerned about the debt and the deficit that needs to be reduced, but we will spend on you. We will offer you an average \$200,000 tax break, so allow us to spend on you.

Somehow the children and the grandchildren are not a worry then. So the mixed messaging on this one is amazing.

□ 1715

Over the last couple of days, I have had the opportunity to either meet in the office or in group sessions or in large gatherings here in Washington with a number of advocates who are concerned about investments that need to be made in this Federal budget.

There is the Alzheimer's Association that is imploring us to find a cure, to invest in research. Washington Republicans say: no, we need to spend on tax cuts for the wealthy, and we need to use your funds to reduce the debt and the deficit.

Washington Republicans will tell our college-bound students who need an affordable path to that higher ed opportunity that: we can't spend on you or invest in you, we need to spend on tax cuts for the wealthy.

Washington Republicans will sweep the savings and the revenues of the Affordable Care Act and proclaim to the senior community that: we are now repealing the Affordable Care Act, all of the benefits that were there for you are now removed.

Washington Republicans will tell a group that I met with about water infrastructure needs: we can't spend on you because we need to spend on tax cuts for the wealthy.

This is a mixed message that is disingenuous.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I think we should be real with the American public. We either stand for spending or we don't. We want to address the debt and deficit or we don't. We believe in investment, as the Democratic minority in this House believes, that will grow the economy and provide a greater opportunity for jobs.

There is this path to prosperity for a few that the Republicans have put together with their budget. I suggest that we look at a highway for hope that has been advanced by the Democrats in the House that invests in Alzheimer's research, higher ed opportunities, infrastructure for this Nation, and a continuation of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I think there is this view that the pie of life is fixed, that society is static—the economy, a fixed pie—and that we here in Washington should decide how to redistribute the slices of the pie.

We reject that whole, entire premise. Life is dynamic. The economy is dynamic. We want to grow the pie for everybody. You don't grow the pie—grow opportunity or grow the economy—if you drive this country to a debt crisis, if you continue spending way beyond your means, if you spend money we

don't have that is taken from the next generation.

This President has already raised taxes \$1.7 trillion. The top effective tax rate on successful small businesses is almost 45 percent. The tax rate on big businesses, like corporations, is 35 percent.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional minute.

Our competitors, the countries we compete with, tax their businesses at 25 percent. When we tax ourselves a lot more than our foreign competitors tax themselves, they win, and we lose.

What we are hearing from the other side is that \$1.7 trillion tax increase is not enough. Let's go farther and tax another \$1.8 trillion.

Then this rhetoric about winners and losers and the few and the this and the that is a notion that all of the good ideas come from Washington. It is a notion that goes beyond the idea that government needs to play a supporting role in our lives, in fulfilling important missions like health and retirement security and a safety net, to government needs to play the commanding role in our lives, that it needs to dictate these things, that government runs the economy, that government decides who wins and who loses.

Guess what, Mr. Chairman? When you do that, the interest groups that they are all complaining about, they are the ones who call the shots up here.

What we are trying to do with this budget is to get the basics right. What we want to do is to make sure that we can make good on these very important missions of health and retirement security, and we want to make sure that people get to decide how it is done in their lives.

We want to make sure that American businesses have what they need to compete and survive and grow and to create jobs in this global economy. What we want to make sure is that we don't live beyond our means so that our kids live below their means. We want to grow this economy.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional minute.

We have got a big debt. We all know that. The question is: Who owns our debt? Who is in control of our future?

We already know we are asking a lot from the next generation, more than any other generation has before. Back when I was born in 1970, 6 percent of our national debt was owned by foreigners. In 1990, when I was in college, 19 percent was owned by foreigners. Today, 47 percent of our national debt is owned by foreigners. They control half of our debt.

That is not in our country's interest. Relying on other countries to cash flow our country—to cash flow our budget—is not smart economics, and we know

we are taking control of our country and are ceding it elsewhere.

This is why we have got to get this debt under control, for our kids, for our grandkids, for our economy, and for our sovereignty.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We all believe in a growing economy, and we all believe in greater prosperity. The issue is how do we make sure we have that prosperity as a country.

We have two very important strains in the American character. One strain is the entrepreneurial strain, the self-reliance strain, and that has helped generate great prosperity in this country.

It has helped unleash huge amounts of potential; yet we have also learned as a country that there are some things we can do better by working together than if we are just hundreds of millions of people who are separately operating on their own, with things like investing in our national infrastructure, with things like investing in a world-class college system, with things like working and investing in medical research, so that we are the world's leader in those areas.

Those are what have made us a world economic power and that have allowed us to support our military.

The problem with the Republican budget is that it ignores that part of the American character. We keep hearing from our colleagues about all of those tax expenditures that are out there, but I just have to go back, Mr. Chairman, to point out that they don't close one of those tax loopholes for the purpose of helping to reduce the deficit.

Because they make that decision—because they decide to say: we are not going to touch those very powerful special interests and the very wealthy—their budget mathematically has to come after other people in the country, after the middle class, after seniors, after our kids' education, after our infrastructure. That is what this is all about.

Our budget and the President's budget dramatically reduce the deficit. They reduce the debt as a function of a share of the economy in the outyears going down. The Republican budget didn't balance until 2040 just a few years ago.

So the issue is whether you are going to be driven by the ideological target or whether your fundamental focus will be jobs and opportunity. That is what ours does.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) control the balance of the time.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank Chairman RYAN of the Budget Committee for the hard work that he has been doing over the last several years as we look to get a handle on the spending problem we have here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, our debt is out of control. In the past 10 years, it has more than doubled, from \$7.1 trillion to \$17.6 trillion today. We paid almost \$416 billion in interest just last year. Imagine where that money could have been better spent.

The failure to address the debt and deficits reduces opportunity and prosperity for future generations. It directly threatens our ability to pay for our priorities like Social Security, Medicare, a strong national defense, and taking care of our veterans.

Unfortunately, President Obama has offered another budget that increases taxes, that expands the government, that does nothing to save Medicare or Social Security, and that never balances. HARRY REID's Senate will not even consider a budget this year.

The budget we offer to the American people protects and preserves Medicare and Social Security, and it balances in 10 years. When Congress responsibly budgets, we increase economic security for our families and ensure that we leave our children and grandchildren with more opportunities and a brighter future.

Mr. Chairman, I call on my colleagues to do the right thing by workers, families, and future generations. Pass this budget.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Oregon, and I thank all of the Members for a thoughtful and important debate.

Mr. Chairman, that is what this is all about. It is about gripping—taking hold—of the heart and soul of America.

As I said in the Rules Committee, the budget is actually a moral document, a moral compass, of where we want to take this country. I think what needs to be explained to the American public is that, in actuality, we have been making progress.

The deficit has gone down from \$1 trillion from the past administration, from the Bush administration, to now \$680 billion. We are making progress, from losing 800,000 jobs a month to gaining close to 200,000; yet the document that is on the floor today, the Ryan budget—the Republican budget—chooses not to have the morality and the affection for the American people that is desired.

When you look at their budget, you will see that \$3.3 trillion of their budget—69 percent—is cut from programs

for people with low or moderate incomes, from the very people who need a staircase of opportunity, and they give \$200,000 in tax cuts to the top 1 percent.

None of us have any challenge to prosperity and opportunity, but how can you have a budget that hits low-income programs or programs that give opportunity?

How many have gone to school because of Pell grants? \$175 million in cuts. How many people have gotten their health care from Medicaid and still do, like children? How many people have needed to have the SNAP program?

I believe that we should have budgets that work for all people. I intend to vote for the CBC budget and for the Democratic budget and “no” on this underlying Republican budget. We need to have a standard that respects all people in this country, and this budget does not.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 96, the House Republicans’ “Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2015.” I oppose this irresponsible budget resolution because it continues the reckless approach to fiscal policy that the House majority has championed for years, with disastrous results.

Mr. Chair, the budgeteers on the majority side have a very poor track record when it comes to economic forecasts and projections.

For years, they have based their entire legislative agenda and strategy on their belief that the Affordable Care Act or “Obamacare” would be a failure.

The wish was father to the thought. But they were wrong.

Because of Obamacare more than 10 million Americans now know the peace of mind that comes from affordable, quality health insurance that is there when you need it. (7 million through the exchange and 3 million through Medicaid).

House Republicans oppose increasing the minimum wage, claiming that it costs jobs. Wrong again. Every increase in the minimum wage has been accompanied by an expanding economy, especially during the Clinton Administration.

House Republicans opposing comprehensive immigration reform claim that it will lead to lower incomes and lost jobs. Wrong again. Studies conducted by groups as far apart as the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO consistently show that comprehensive immigration reform will grow the Gross Domestic Product by \$1.5 trillion over 10 years.

Given this sorry track record of economic forecasting, I strongly oppose the Republican budget because it favors the wealthy over middle class families and those struggling to enter or remain in the middle class.

I oppose this Republican budget because it asks major sacrifices of seniors who can barely make ends meet, and fundamentally alters the social contract by turning Medicaid and SNAP programs into a block grant and Medicare into a voucher.

I cannot and will not support a resolution that attempts to balance the budget on the backs of working families, seniors, children, the poor, or mortgages the future by failing to make the investments needed to sustain economic growth and opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. Chair, we Democrats have a better way. We understand that we are all in this together and that our current economic situation calls for a balanced approach between increased revenues and responsible reduction in expenditures.

Our plan will protect and strengthen our recovering economy, reduce the deficit in a responsible way, while continuing to invest in the things that make our country strong like education, health care, innovation, and clean energy.

Mr. Chair, this Republican budget is bad for America but it is disastrous for the people from my home state of Texas who sent me here to advocate for their interests. Let me highlight a few examples.

1. If the Republican budget resolution were to become the basis of federal fiscal policy, 3,435,336 Texas seniors would be forced out of traditional Medicare and into a voucher program. Under the Republican plan to end Medicare as we know it, Texas seniors will receive a voucher instead of guaranteed benefits under traditional Medicare.

2. For the 3,435,336 Texans aged 45–54, the value of their vouchers would be capped at growth levels that are lower than the projected increases in health care costs. Previous analyses showed that this type of plan would cut future spending by \$5,900 per senior, forcing them to spend more out of pocket and diminishing their access to quality care.

3. Additionally, private insurance plans will aggressively pursue the healthiest, least expensive enrollees, thereby allowing Medicare—currently the lifeline for 3,187,332 Texas seniors—to “wither on the vine.”

4. If the Republican budget resolution were to be adopted by Congress, 206,304 Texas seniors would pay more for prescription drugs next year.

5. The Republican plan would re-open the “donut hole,” forcing seniors to pay the full cost of their prescription drugs if their yearly drug expenses are more than \$2,970 for the year.

6. Seniors reaching the prescription drug “donut hole” would pay an average of \$828 more in prescription drug costs in 2014 and approximately \$13,000 more from now through 2022.

7. Under the Republican budget, the 2,445,462 Texas seniors who utilized free preventive services currently covered by Medicare in 2012 will face increased costs in the form of higher deductibles, co-insurance, and copayments for certain services, including even cancer screenings and annual wellness visits.

8. The Republican budget slashes \$31.71 billion in nursing home care and other health care services for 754,500 Texas seniors and disabled who currently rely on Medicaid for their long-term care needs.

9. The draconian cuts included in the Republican budget would have a devastating impact on the 1,191 certified nursing homes in Texas that serve 91,717 seniors, with more than half relying on Medicaid as their primary payer. As a result, nursing homes would be forced to slash services, turn away seniors, or close their doors.

Mr. Chair, this budget could have invested in programs that help strengthen the middle class, reduce poverty, and strengthen our economic recovery. Instead, the Republican budget makes deep cuts to the area of the budget

helping low-income families put food on the table and make ends meet.

These are families who are already struggling with unemployment, lower wages, and just simply trying to make ends meet.

The House Republican budget will push millions more Americans into poverty and put a large number of low-income children, seniors, and people with disabilities at risk.

It guts Medicare and Medicaid and calls for massive cuts to food assistance, all in order to protect tax breaks for special interests and for multimillionaires who are not even asking for them.

The Republican budget may be characterized in many ways—cruel, irresponsible, short-sighted, reckless—but “fair and balanced” is not one of them.

In contrast, the alternative budgets proposed by the Democratic Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and Congressional Progressive Caucus, which were made in order by the Rules Committee, are each worthy of support because they fairly balance the need for increased revenues and responsible reductions in expenditures with the imperative of making the necessary investments in human capital required to move our country forward.

Specifically, the Alternative Budgets proposed by the Democratic Caucus, CBC, and CPC:

- help create more jobs now;
- replace the sequester;
- make key education investments;
- invest in research and development and clean energy;
- invest in long-term infrastructure;
- preserve Medicare as we know it;
- protect health reform’s benefits for seniors;
- protect Medicaid for seniors in nursing homes;
- preserve Supplemental Nutrition Assistance (SNAP);

reduce the deficit through a smart, targeted, and steady approach provides tax relief for working families and ends tax breaks for the wealthy;

take a balanced approach to reducing the long-term deficits and debt; and put the budget on a sustainable path

Mr. Chair, under the Democratic budget, the deficit would fall from 7 percent of GDP in 2014 to 2.3 percent of GDP in 2024.

The Democratic Budget Alternative will generate at least a million more jobs this year compared to the Republicans’ “austerity first” plan by making the investments needed to create jobs, strengthen the middle class, create greater upward mobility, and ensure opportunity for our children and future generations.

The Democratic alternative budgets extend Emergency Unemployment Compensation for the long-term unemployed, which provides a lifeline to the 2.37 million jobless workers who have already lost their benefits and the 72,000 persons who stand to lose their benefits each week if Congress does not act.

Additionally, the Democratic budget immediately ends the Sequester, which would otherwise cost the economy 750,000 jobs by the end of the year, and replaces it with deficit reduction resulting from a balanced approach combining responsible spending cuts with increased revenues by cutting tax breaks for special interests and wealthy individuals without increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans.

Mr. Chair, the Democratic alternative budget maintains our commitment to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security; expands the EITC for childless workers; extends the tax credits from the American Taxpayer Relief Act due to expire at the end of 2017, and provides \$7.6 billion annually for early childhood education.

It is said often, Mr. Chair, but is no less true, that the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of the nation's most cherished values. As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

"The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped."

For that reason that in evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility. To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the budget must also pass a "moral test."

The Republican budget resolution fails both of these standards. The Democratic alternatives do not. For these compelling reasons, I stand in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 96 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this ill-conceived and unwise measure.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons I ran over here right now is that I have been listening to some of the speakers on the left.

As the gentlewoman just spoke, in referring to the budget as a moral document, I actually somewhat agree with that, but let's actually discuss what is moral for the next generation and the generation after that and the generation after that.

For the fun of it, as I was running out the door, I grabbed this little poster which had been dropped off to me last week. It is a little poster from over at the Mercatus Center, which has been doing some calculations of what the United States' debt would look like if you took the debt in the unfunded liabilities of this country and put it on GAAP accounting, so if you actually treated it honestly.

What is the real number, the typical actuarial 75-year window, attached with regular debt?

Process in your mind what you have been told year after year of our unfunded liabilities, and I need you to wipe that number clean. The number they came up with recently has hit \$205 trillion of debt in unfunded liabilities.

You do realize, if you go right now to Google and look up the best estimates of the wealth of the world, our unfunded liabilities are now exceeding many of the estimates of the wealth of the entire world.

This is what so many Members are willing to hand to our children, to our great-grandchildren, and to the future generations?

If you want to make a moral argument, that debt—those unfunded liabilities—is the moral argument.

□ 1730

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman. We are both making an argument that aligns with our points of view on the budget, and the bottom line here is that we have got to invest, we have got to have a balanced budget, and we have got to figure out how to do it. But the question I have about this budget is: What is going to happen to the potholes in America?

I came out of a State legislature where we had constraints on us. We had to find ways to pay our bills within the means of the people of Vermont to be able to pay them. We had to deal with real problems. It required a confident approach to investing in the future. That has to be part of a budget.

America's roads are falling apart. Our bridges are falling down. This is a real disaster when it comes to meeting the infrastructure needs of this country. The American Society of Civil Engineers rates our infrastructure D-plus and estimates that the amount of investment needed by 2020 is \$3.6 billion.

This budget accepts the looming insolvency of the highway trust fund, and it does absolutely nothing to fix it. Those potholes are not going to fix themselves. And that is not a Republican or Democratic deal. Those are potholes in your district and mine.

It is scientific research as well. Both sides of the aisle are proud of America's scientific achievements. What this budget continues to do is reduce and squeeze National Institutes of Health grants by about 1,400. Just in the State of Vermont, the University of Vermont has seen a 20 percent drop in those research grants that help those with Ph.D.'s find cures for diseases in the future.

A confident nation is going to fix its roads.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. May I inquire how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has approximately 34 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oregon has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Having the right to close, we have no more speakers on this side.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Just so I understand, the majority has consumed 34 minutes?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 34 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oregon has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield myself 2 minutes.

I do appreciate the back-and-forth discussion here, but I want to put this in perspective, if I could, because our friends with the Republican budget

have assumed, for instance, that we don't necessarily have to raise taxes. We could actually cut some of the loopholes that we have offered repeatedly; and although that is referred to rhetorically, they have never been able to follow through with any that they would cut.

There are Medicaid cuts. And make no mistake about it, these Medicaid cuts are actually reductions in nursing home care for America's most vulnerable. That is two-thirds of this money that it is going to be visited back on the States and impacting families.

They repeal the Affordable Care Act, but they keep all the associated revenues.

We went through a campaign season excoriating Democrats for the reductions in Medicare Advantage, and they keep that in their budget.

There is the magic of dynamic scoring, which we have heard about repeatedly for years, which never really quite proves itself.

And then we have cuts to Pell grants. We heard described in committee that these cuts to Pell grants are not a problem because they are just an excuse to raise tuition and enrich lavish academic salaries.

Mr. Chairman, this Republican budget would not only freeze us into a downward decline in our infrastructure, it would be the lowest level of nonmilitary discretionary spending that we have seen in generations. It is not going to happen; it shouldn't happen; and my Republican friends should not be able to get away with assuming that this is a viable and responsible approach.

I hope we will come to the point again where we can find a way to come together to deal with things that we actually agree on in a tangible way and make some real progress.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, budgeting is about choosing. Budgeting is about setting priorities. In this particular case, it is about setting a path for the country.

We have got serious fiscal challenges unlike any we have ever had before; and when we look at some of these fiscal challenges, it is very clear that the sooner we get on top of these problems, the sooner we deal with these problems, the better off everybody is going to be.

Here, in a nutshell, is our big fiscal issue. It is not a Democrat or Republican thing. It is not a partisan thing. It is really sort of a demographic and math thing.

We are going from roughly 40 million seniors to about 80 million seniors, retirees. The baby boomers are retiring, 10,000 people a day, at this pace, for 10 years. The programs that they rely on, like Medicare—really important programs—grow 6 to 8 percent a year.

So when you have a pay-as-you-go system where current workers pay current taxes under their current paychecks to pay for current retirees—as I

am paying my payroll taxes for my mom's Medicare and Social Security benefits, and when I am retired, my kids will do the same for me—and you have an 89 percent increase in the retirement population but about a 17 percent increase in the taxpaying population, therein lies your challenge.

So these programs are growing so much faster than our ability to pay. They are growing faster than wages, economy, and revenues, to the point where these programs that we rely on that are so special and necessary—I have seen Social Security and Medicare do important things in my own family and my own life—these things are going bankrupt. The sooner we fix it, the better off we are all going to be.

The other problem is, if we don't fix this, if we don't even show the world or the country that we intend to fix this, our economy really suffers, because the economy, businesses, banks, credit unions, creditors, small businesses, and large businesses don't know what the future is going to look like.

So all these things we need to do to get people to take risks and hire people and invest and start a new business, we are slowing that down. That is why the CBO says the economy is slowing down. It is hard to get people out of poverty if we don't have good jobs for them to get out of poverty with.

If you look at this chart, we are going into uncharted territory. We have had big debt before. Our debt was as big as our economy in World War II, but for the years we fought World War II, then it went back down.

Because of this problem I described—not a Republican or Democrat problem, but just America's problem—our debt has grown more than twice the size of our economy. You can't have a prosperous society with that kind of debt. It has never been done before.

And so what we are saying is let's get ahead of this problem. Let's phase in these reforms so that we can make good on our promise to our seniors who have already retired and so that all those people nearing retirement—people in their later fifties thinking and planning for their retirement—let's make good for them. But let's acknowledge that those of us in the X generation and lower—those younger—these programs will not be there for us when we retire. We need to fix this.

And by the way, we need pro-growth solutions: reform the Tax Code, balance the budget, have an energy renaissance in America, and streamline regulations so businesses know how to plan so that we can create jobs and economic growth. This budget does all of that. That is why I urge its adoption, and that is why I look forward to continuing this debate tomorrow.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARR) having assumed the chair, Mr.

HASTINGS of Washington, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024, had come to no resolution thereon.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Senate acted forcefully by passing legislation to renew emergency unemployment insurance. I would encourage this House to follow that example so we may provide a vital lifeline to over 2 million Americans to provide for their families. These are hardworking Americans who are out there every day looking for employment or receiving education to be better prepared to reenter the workforce.

In Ohio, 75,200 unemployed workers need these extended benefits they earned. As our economy continues recovering from the greatest recession in modern history, let us give them what they earned.

We must avoid making this a partisan issue. Workers in both Democratic and Republican districts desperately need this critical lifeline. The House must act today. Let the Speaker bring the Senate bill up for a vote here so the House can finally pass legislation.

Let us do what is sensible and allow these Americans to keep our economic recovery going by not falling into the ranks of poverty themselves. These hardworking Americans have earned their benefits.

[From The New York Times, Aug. 30, 2012]

MAJORITY OF NEW JOBS PAY LOW WAGES,
STUDY FINDS

(By Catherine Rampell)

While a majority of jobs lost during the downturn were in the middle range of wages, a majority of those added during the recovery have been low paying, according to a new report from the National Employment Law Project.

The disappearance of midwage, midskill jobs is part of a longer-term trend that some refer to as a hollowing out of the work force, though it has probably been accelerated by government layoffs.

"The overarching message here is we don't just have a jobs deficit; we have a 'good jobs' deficit," said Annette Bernhardt, the report's author and a policy co-director at the National Employment Law Project, a liberal research and advocacy group.

The report looked at 366 occupations tracked by the Labor Department and clumped them into three equal groups by wage, with each representing a third of American employment in 2008. The middle third—occupations in fields like construction, manufacturing and information, with median hourly wages of \$13.84 to \$21.13—accounted for 60 percent of job losses from the beginning of 2008 to early 2010.

The job market has turned around since then, but those fields have represented only 22 percent of total job growth. Higher-wage occupations—those with a median wage of \$21.14 to \$54.55—represented 19 percent of job losses when employment was falling, and 20 percent of job gains when employment began growing again.

Lower-wage occupations, with median hourly wages of \$7.69 to \$13.83, accounted for 21 percent of job losses during the retraction. Since employment started expanding, they have accounted for 58 percent of all job growth.

The occupations with the fastest growth were retail sales (at a median wage of \$10.97 an hour) and food preparation workers (\$9.04 an hour). Each category has grown by more than 300,000 workers since June 2009.

Some of these new, lower-paying jobs are being taken by people just entering the labor force, like recent high school and college graduates. Many, though, are being filled by older workers who lost more lucrative jobs in the recession and were forced to take something to scrape by.

"I think I've been very resilient and resistant and optimistic, up until very recently," said Ellen Pinney, 56, who was dismissed from a \$75,000-a-year job in which she managed procurement and supply for an electronics company in March 2008.

Since then, she has cobbled together a series of temporary jobs in retail and home health care and worked as a part-time receptionist for a beauty salon. She is now working as an unpaid intern for a construction company, putting together bids and business plans for green energy projects, and has moved in with her 86-year-old father in Forked River, N.J.

"I really can't bear it anymore," she said, noting that her applications to places like PetSmart and Target had gone unanswered. "From every standpoint—my independence, my sense of purposefulness, my self-esteem, my life planning—this is just not what I was planning."

As Ms. Pinney's experience shows, low-wage jobs have not been growing especially quickly in this recovery; they account for such a big share of job growth mostly because midwage job growth has been so slow.

Over the last few decades, the number of midwage, midskill jobs has stagnated or declined as employers chose to automate routine tasks or to move them offshore.

Job growth has been concentrated in positions that tend to fall into two categories: manual work that must be done in person, like styling hair or serving food, which usually pays relatively little; and more creative, design-oriented work like engineering or surgery, which often pays quite well.

Since 2001, employment has grown 8.7 percent in lower-wage occupations and 6.6 percent in high-wage ones. Over that period, midwage occupation employment has fallen by 7.3 percent.

This "polarization" of skills and wages has been documented meticulously by David H. Autor, an economics professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. A recent study found that this polarization accelerated in the last three recessions, particularly the last one, as financial pressures forced companies to reorganize more quickly.

"This is not just a nice, smooth process," said Henry E. Siu, an economics professor at the University of British Columbia, who helped write the recent study about polarization and the business cycle. "A lot of these jobs were suddenly wiped out during recession and are not coming back."

On top of private sector revamps, state and local governments have been shedding workers in recent years. Those jobs lost in the public sector have been primarily in mid and

higher-wage positions, according to Ms. Bernhardt's analysis.

"Whenever you look at data like these, there is this tendency to get overwhelmed, that there are these inevitable, big macro forces causing this polarization and we can't do anything about them. In fact, we can," Ms. Bernhardt said. She called for more funds for states to stem losses in the public sector and federal infrastructure projects to employ idled construction workers. Both proposals have faced resistance from Republicans in Congress.

REMEMBERING THE RWANDAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, my Special Order deals with the very difficult and even painful subject of Rwanda.

Mr. Speaker, there is an ancient story about Rwanda. It is one from which a number of meanings can be extracted.

We are here today because we remember the victims of the horrific events in our world's history. We honor survivors and recognize the steps that have been taken to remedy the atrocities that have occurred.

Over and over, you will hear people on this floor, Mr. Speaker, say that things that have happened in our history that were horrific and inhuman shall never happen again. Things like American slavery and the European extermination, mainly by Germany, of Jews throughout Europe should never happen again.

□ 1745

So we must continue to fight for justice as the international issues come to our consciousness. And we know that, as time moves on, there will be additional tragedies around the globe.

Rwanda has certainly experienced its share, if not more than its share, of tragedy. This ancient parable in Rwandan is, God spends the day elsewhere, but he sleeps in Rwanda—Imana yirirwa ahandi igataha I Rwanda. For those of us who are familiar with the creation story, we know that God worked for 6 days and then rested. The Rwandan people believe that God, on the seventh day, came to Rwanda to rest from his work the previous 6 days.

Rwanda is 1 mile above sea level, about what Denver, Colorado is. And because of its elevation, Rwanda is paradisiacal, in the sense that the climate

is cooler in Rwanda than it is in many of the other parts of Africa, certainly sub-Saharan Africa, and the greenery is like that of no other place in Africa, and it will rival even some of the beautiful spots in the Caribbean.

It is also a fabulous place, the Rwandans thought, for God to come to rest.

Well, in a country of seven million, at least in 1994—who knows what the population is today, after many of the atrocities, but the people believed that God could rest there in this beautiful, this lush, very, very receiving and welcoming land, without being interrupted.

Now, all cultures, all religions choose to elevate its land or its people. For example, the Jewish people, understandably, refer to the Sea of Galilee as a sea. For those who know geography, you know that the Sea of Galilee is actually a lake.

The Jordan River—before I went there for the first time, back in 1994, I envisioned the Jordan River as something comparable to the Mississippi River or something comparable to the Missouri River, which is about 2,000 miles across the country.

The truth of the matter is, there were certain points of the Jordan River that I actually jumped over. And it flows down into the Dead Sea, which is, again, not a sea, but another lake.

So it is understandable that people will declare something to be a little more than it really is. So the Rwandan people, believing that God came to their country, this paradise, 1 mile above sea level, was something that, I think, many of us would have done had we been Rwandans.

I also know that there were people who would question how could God sleep in a place with all of the genocide that has taken place there, with all of the violence against the men and women and children, and even violence based on tribal ethnicity. But the Rwandan people still believe that God sleeps in their country.

I believe that God sleeps in Rwanda, but I also believe that He is awakened because of what has happened. God can neither sleep nor slumber where there is injustice, where there is wrong, where there is murder, and so God has had an unrestful amount of time, unrestful nights in Rwanda since the beginning of the great genocide.

800,000 people, Mr. Speaker, mostly ethnic Tutsis and moderate Hutus, died at the hand of Hutu extremists during a 100-day period; a 100-day period.

That would be killing all the people of my hometown of Kansas City, Missouri, the largest city in our State, and all the people 221 miles away in St. Louis. Both cities would be completely exterminated if they lost 800,000 people.

But the Rwandan people lost 800,000 people in 100 days. That is seven individuals, seven human beings created by God, murdered every 7 minutes.

Ten thousand victims were killed each day. Just think about it: 10,000

human beings created with the hands of the alms-giving God. And then someone stole their lives for something as petty as ethnicity, something as petty as a different language.

So when you think about hundreds of thousands of victims who were murdered, there are hundreds of other thousands of victims who were infected with HIV, as the Hutu extremists raped, as a tool of violence, women and young girls.

The killing ended once Tutsi rebel forces attacked and retook the country.

When I think about what we have done and what we have spent in lands around the world, to tragedies no less repulsive, I have to raise the question, why has the United States been asleep, lo, these many years?

I think that our children and our children's children will look back on the nineties, in particular, and wonder, where were the Americans?

Where was the United States while this happened?

Now, 20 years after all of the genocide, Rwanda has moved stunningly in a new and positive direction. I am very pleased that they have, and all Americans should be pleased. But there still is much work to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. CLEAVER, I appreciate you doing this.

You know, it is just staggering to think about what happened and all of those people going about their daily lives 20 years ago, on April 7, and knowing they are going to die, knowing their loved ones are going to die.

It is so unspeakable that we can't, I can't really imagine what it would be like to live in that country, to live in a neighborhood where you know your moment is coming, where you have a child who is going to die before your very eyes, where your daughter is going to be raped and then killed.

To have this sense of the horror of what is taking place, it is unspeakable. But the realization that the world is going to ignore it, and that happened, day in and day out. Most of us didn't even know about it. There would be reports, but it would be in a distant place. It wasn't anything that you could do anything about.

It was only as the stories fully came out and the horror was fully revealed that the collective gaze of the world that was not acting—there were all kinds of reasons why I suppose we couldn't or we didn't.

But just try to put yourself in the place of the family, up and down that country, where the word is going from one village to another, from one community to another, from one family to another, that you have got to do everything you can to get out.

And where you live in a community where the majority is going to kill you if they find you, where, as you hide and try to conceal yourself or your kids, you can't figure out how to feed them,

and you have got to come out into the light of day and put yourself at the mercy of your luck, where do you find or meet somebody who might give you a meal so that you can carry on another day.

It is not anything that I can imagine, just the wholesale use of murder in ethnic cleansing, in order to achieve a political goal.

What is an amazing thing is what Mr. CLEAVER just told us, about the recovery of Rwanda. These people go on.

Imagine living with the heartache that will never leave you, that you lost a son or daughter, a parent or grandparent. How do you get yourself up and start all over again?

How do you deal with the hatred that you have to fight because it will consume you and prevent you from carrying on yourself?

How do you do that?

The people in Rwanda are doing that and rebuilding that country, rebuilding their economy, and facing life on a day-in-and-day-out basis.

But having a moment to pause and remember is, I think, humbling for all of us. The capacity that we have, as people, to go awry and do things that never, in a million years, do we think was possible, reminds me of just how fragile life is and how really, in a lot of ways, fragile good governance is. You can't take it for granted.

I think all of us here know that there are forces that can get unleashed which, once they are, have an enormously powerful and destructive tendency. The challenge for all of us is to create ways where we can resolve conflict in peaceful and civil ways. The work of that is the work of this Congress and the work of this democracy.

It is fragile. It isn't anything we can ever take for granted. It has to be with that purpose of allowing people to find ways to resolve differences peacefully.

So this is an amazing moment, 20 years after the beginning of the slaughter of 800,000 innocent people, and a slaughter by very cruel and very painful and very relentless efforts.

So thank you so much, Mr. CLEAVER, for allowing us to have this moment of reflection.

Mr. CLEAVER. Thank you to Mr. WELCH, who is a very conscientious Member of this body. We appreciate his sensitivity, as well as that of many others who probably will not be here on the floor.

I will state again, because Congressman WELCH has mentioned it, that is 800,000 people, 800,000 people killed, murdered in 100 days. 10,000 human beings killed every 24 hours in this world during our lifetime.

So the Rwandans' ancient parable about God sleeping at night in Rwanda is only partially true. God could not sleep nor slumber with this kind of tragedy taking place anywhere in a world that He created for freedom and justice and peace and harmony.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman

from the Fifth District of Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the whip of the Democratic Caucus.

□ 1800

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Never again. We intone those words, "never again." We intone those words because we have seen horror and felt guilt that it happens on our watch, and so we say "never again."

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of chairing the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. That commission was formed as a result of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act in 1975 by Gerald Ford and leaders of 34 other European nations, including the Soviet Union, including West Germany, including East Germany. Never again.

The extraordinary Holocaust that cost the lives of millions and millions and millions and millions more; not only in the Holocaust, where 6 million Jews were taken from us, taken from their families, taken from their countries, taken from life, but millions more in Russia, Ukraine, and literally in scores of other venues murdered.

They were murdered not because of their engagement in war, not because of their engagement in crime, but because of who they were, what religion they had, what ethnic background they claimed—murdered—murdered because of what they were, and the murderers did not like what they were—not their character, not their intellect, not their conduct, but who they were.

So here we are, 20 years later, having watched as genocide was, again, perpetrated in Rwanda. The genocide in Rwanda, the 20th anniversary of which we mark this week, provided Americans with one of our most painful examples of a failure to act, but not Americans alone, Mr. Speaker. The entire civilized world waited, watched, lamented, but did not stop the genocide.

America and much of the world waited far too long to become involved in Rwanda, and even then, international peacekeepers were not given a mandate for the resources to stop the killing.

I am sure many of us, Mr. Speaker, saw the movie "Hotel Rwanda." Nick Nolte played the blue-helmeted colonel who was in charge of the U.N. unit. When carnage was occurring and the colonel that Nolte was playing was watching, someone asked: Why aren't you doing something? And his response was: because that is not our mandate, it is to report.

I will say, in a minute, that thousands of lives were saved by the blue helmets and by others, but the U.N. mandate was not to stop it, but to report it.

President Clinton has expressed regret that the United States did not act in time to save lives, saying last year, "If we'd gone in sooner, I believe we could have saved at least a third of the lives that were lost."

Now, the figure of 800,000 is being used, but that is an estimate. It could be as little, perhaps, as 500,000 and as many as 1 million-plus. It is estimated that more than 1 million men, women, and children were killed in a span of—as my friend from Missouri, Reverend CLEAVER—Congressman EMANUEL CLEAVER has said. 1 million in 100 days, 10,000 victims every day, 7 people shot or hacked to death with machetes every minute, every minute, and the world watched and wrung its hands and said how wrong that was, and the machetes kept hacking.

More than just killing, the Rwandan genocide left hundreds of thousands of people infected with HIV as a result of another implement of war that those who perpetrate genocide have used, rape, a crime not of sexual desire, but of violence, of injury, of hate.

Widows of murdered men were infected and, in many cases, left to bear the children of their rapist. The children, of course, were infected, too.

The violence left 400,000 orphans, small children who then had to learn at a young age how to care for their younger siblings on their own.

Mr. Speaker, the Rwandan genocide provided the world with yet another lesson in our shared responsibility not just to say the words "never again," but to mean them. Mr. Speaker, we are our brother's keeper, and our brother needs our vigilance and our help, as we need his; and we are our sister's keeper, just as well.

Just as the genocide displayed humanity's darkest side, it also provided us with proof of human courage and defiance in the face of evil. From the outnumbered U.N. peacekeepers who saved lives wherever they could—and that ability was far too limited—to the individual Rwandans who risked death and rape to protect their neighbors, we acknowledge those few moments of moral clarity in the midst of great evil.

I said that I was the chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Mr. Speaker, 250,000 Bosniaks lost their lives in a genocide perpetrated by Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic.

We finally acted in that case and saved literally hundreds of thousands of more, deposed Milosevic, and put him in the dock for war crimes in the Hague, but not before 8,000 souls in Bosnia were gunned down and murdered in Trebenista. The U.N. troops failed to stop that—again, insufficient resources.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we mark this 20th anniversary of the genocide in Rwanda, I join my colleagues in mourning those who were killed and in recognizing the many changes Rwanda has undergone over the past two decades. We all wish Rwanda continued success in its efforts to take from the ashes a successful society and to protect the safety and freedom of its people.

I hope Americans across the country will take some time this week to reflect not only on the Rwandan genocide, but on all genocides, to remember its horrors and to promise never to let our Nation sit idly by as a genocide takes place. Mr. Speaker, it is a complicated conclusion, too long, too often delayed.

I want to thank my colleagues for joining me to recognize this solemn anniversary. I want to thank, in particular, my dear friend from Missouri, EMANUEL CLEAVER, who preaches to his flock, who preaches to his constituents and, yes, who preaches to all of us to look to the better nature of our souls, to reach out, to lift up, to protect, to give solace, to give sympathy, to give empathy, to give understanding, and to be our brother's keeper.

Mr. CLEAVER. I thank the distinguished whip for his comments and for, frankly, requesting that we have the opportunity this evening to remember those horrific events in world history.

As the whip said, we must declare "never again," and it must be real and serious; and, if necessary, we must redouble our efforts against evil anywhere it presents its ugly head.

The pain that I am still feeling here tonight is because, since 1995, the international tribunal has indicted 95 individuals. Let me go back and remind you, 800,000—it could be many more—died, 95 individuals have been indicted, and there have been 49 convictions.

Now, if there is a person with a heart anywhere on the planet, that heart should be broken right now, knowing what happened to the Rwandan people, what happened to women, little girls, children. The world shall not tolerate this again.

I would like to now yield to the distinguished Congressman from the Ninth District of Memphis, Tennessee, Mr. STEVE COHEN.

Mr. COHEN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding, and I appreciate the whip for bringing this hour to the attention of Members of Congress and the opportunity to speak on this historic 20th anniversary of this slaughter.

I had the opportunity to visit Rwanda in the company of one of the great men who served in this House, Congressman DONALD PAYNE of New Jersey. Congressman PAYNE had made several trips to Rwanda and several trips to Africa.

We visited the memorial there to the victims, which is a very special place in the world, burial spots and flowers and plaques and the museum company there, too. It made a great impression on me, and it would make a great impression on anybody.

One thing that came out of the trip was my realization that today, in Rwanda, the Hutus and the Tutsis get along and that what was horrific 20 years ago, in one of the most horrific ethnic cleansings—or attempted ethnic cleansings and hate, atrocities, murders, over time, the Rwandan people have overcome them.

The distinctions are no longer present, and the people do get along. Obviously, because of the horrific situation, there is an imbalance in the populations, and I am sure there are still some memories; but we do need to learn, as I am sure has been said, about when we turn to thinking of other people as different because we are all the same.

There was a time a little after this, I think it was about 1999, when I was at Union Station. President Clinton was there, and we had some time to talk, and he related how the Human Genome Project that Dr. Francis Collins—now the head of the NIH—was heading up and how that we are all 99.96 percent the same, and we are.

He mentioned the Hutus and the Tutsis and how they were just so, so, so, so, so alike, but the minor differences that were visible caused them to have this awful, awful, horrific genocide.

It pained President Clinton. Whip HOYER mentioned that this is something that he brought up before, that it was a mistake while he was President not to intervene. It was right after the difficulty that we had in Mogadishu with the helicopter and the way the American soldiers were killed and horrifically treated in the streets of Mogadishu by the Somali groups there.

It was a reticence to get involved in another situation in Africa, and it is a tight line sometimes to determine when you go in and when you don't. Well, the President made a mistake there, as he has admitted over the years.

If we look at other situations that might present themselves to us, as Members of Congress, we have to realize the United States of America has a special place in the world.

We are the only country that has the ability to see that mankind doesn't engage in horrific genocides again, so when the opportunity for the United States to get involved and prevent a slaughter, prevent a genocide, the United States has a responsibility.

Inasmuch as it is difficult after the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan to commit our troops to action when situations like Rwanda present themselves, it is incumbent upon us, I think, to support—whoever is the President—in taking the proper actions to preserve humanity.

□ 1815

So I thank Whip HOYER for calling for this hour and Mr. CLEAVER for leading it, and I just wanted to add my thoughts and my reflections after having visited Rwanda with a great Member of Congress, DONALD PAYNE.

Mr. CLEAVER. Thank you, Mr. COHEN.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about the remaining time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 28 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REMEMBERING THE RWANDAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) is recognized for the remainder of the time as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CLEAVER for giving his voice of remembrance, his voice of comfort, his voice of concern, his voice that says this terrible genocide shall never happen again, nor should anybody who is of the human species sit back and allow such a tragedy to occur as what happened 20 years ago when, simply because of being a member of a different tribe, people were killed.

When I visited Rwanda, I had the opportunity to go to the museum where memorials were set up, but you saw the remains, the bones, of a number of individuals that were slaughtered, and you also learned the history of what took place in Rwanda, how the people were taught, especially during colonization, to make one feel that they were better than the other and one should rule over the other. And it went on to such a time when people started to cry out for equality and democracy moving on, and just because they happened to be of a different tribe, the Hutu majority, to terminate the Tutsi ethnic group.

Tragedy. Husbands turning in their wives, wives turning in their husbands where there were mixed groups, feeling one was superior to the other. Tragedy. Yet, the global community sat silently on the sidelines—sat silently on the sidelines.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, before I say more, I see the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Illinois and the city of Chicago, and I yield to the Honorable DANNY DAVIS.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from New York, Representative GREGORY MEEKS not only for yielding, not only for being engaged in this discussion, but for the tremendous amount of time, energy, and effort that he spends dealing with international issues, recognizing that every day, as we see the increases in technology and our ability to communicate more effectively with other people across the world, how small and how much smaller our world is becoming, so things that may have been considered far away are now much closer to our everyday existence. So I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

I also want to commend Representative EMANUEL CLEAVER and our whip for convening this session. As I listened to Representative CLEAVER give a bit of the history of Rwanda, I was actually glued to the television set and felt immobilized that I couldn't or didn't want to move. And to think that during the last two decades we would experience, in our modern-day world, such horrific actions as that which we are

commemorating and remembering here today some 20 years later, to think that the international community sat by, watched, discussed, but didn't move, wouldn't move, couldn't move, and watched 800,000 people, and perhaps even more, be annihilated, wiped out, to see them experience some of the most horrific actions that could be taken against a people. I guess the whole lot of us share in the blame because we saw it, didn't move on it, couldn't find a way to bring world interest, world concerns together to stop it or prevent it before all of these people had lost their lives. And so, yes, it is shame on our world, and all of us must take some of the responsibility and share in the blame.

When a tragedy is occurring to some of us, it really affects, in a way, all of us. When a government is unable or unwilling to protect its people, then it becomes a world issue, and the rest of us have the responsibility to step in. And as much as some of us abhor war and as much as we know that it is not the best utilization to get involved in warlike activity that is unnecessary, I think that there are some things that you just can't let go without doing whatever it is that you can do.

So I hope that our world is saying that never, ever again will we stand by and let such as this take place, that never, ever again will we be immobilized and wondering about what to do or can we do or should we do. We know that something must be done.

So, GREG, again, I thank you for not only yielding, but I thank you for your leadership on international affairs which helps us to know that, yes, we can be our brothers' keepers. And our brothers don't have to be just across the street—they can be across the ocean; they can be across the continent; they can be in other lands—because all of us are joined together as a part of the mutual elements of our world. So I thank you for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Outreach Programme on the Rwanda Genocide and the United Nations reported that between April and June of 1994, as the international community watched, more than 800,000 Rwandans, mostly ethnic Tutsi, were massacred by Hutu militia and government forces over a period of just 100 days. The killings began the day after a plane carrying the presidents of Rwanda and Burundi was shot down as it prepared to land in Kigali, the capital of Rwanda. The presidents were returning from peace talks aimed at shoring up a fragile peace agreement and ending the conflict between the largely ethnic Hutu-dominated government and the largely Tutsi rebel army. The crash reignited the war. Retreating government forces joined ethnic Hutu militia in inciting civilians to kill ethnic Tutsis. They alleged that civilians were helping the Tutsi rebels and used this to justify the mass targeting of innocent peoples. A small peacekeeping force which had been sent by the United Nations to monitor the peace accord was not authorized to intervene. A warning that genocide was planned was not acted upon. Today, the effects of the genocide

in Rwanda are still felt in many different ways both inside the country and in neighboring states, including in the eastern regions of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where large areas of South Kivu province are still controlled by Hutu militia from Rwanda and their local allies. Alongside other fighters in the Congo war, they continue to commit serious human rights violations, including abductions, killings and rape. Sexual violence, particularly against women and children, is widespread.

This week marks the 20th year anniversary of the Rwandan Genocide. Since this genocide, certain concepts and initiatives have come forward by the international community that when a nation fails to protect its citizens or people the responsibility relies upon the international community to step in to stop the killing of people.

Mr. MEEKS. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois, from the great city of Chicago, who long before he came to Congress, as a member of the Chicago City Council, spoke truth to power. And the words he has just articulated, that we should never forget that we will make sure that we are our brothers' keeper, that we need not have what I would call a gang mentality ourselves, that simply because someone is away across the ocean, may not look like some of us look, may not talk or speak the way we speak, that when we see evil, we won't stand silently by. We will stand against it and fight.

Dr. King once said that injustice everywhere is a threat to justice everywhere, and so it is that evil anywhere is a threat to all of us everywhere.

Yesterday, Rwanda launched a week of official mourning to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the genocide which left 800,000 people dead and changed the face of a nation forever, and I want the people of Rwanda to know that I stand in solidarity with them during this week of mourning. But I will also stand with them next week, and I will stand with them the week after that, and I will stand with them the week after, because what happened during the spring and summer of 1994 is too important to be mourned only on an anniversary.

The tragic consequences of ethnic hatred and violence must never be forgotten, for we must never allow the events of 1994 to be repeated—not in Rwanda or anywhere else. We must, once and for all, put all racial and ethnic strife behind us as we strive for a better and a brighter future for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, we have, in this Chamber today, one whose voice has always spoken about justice, one whose actions were to feed those who were hungry, clothe those who had no clothes, and put a roof over the head of those who were homeless. We have in the Chamber today, Mr. Speaker, an individual who didn't sit idly by and quietly when he saw injustices take place here in America. He stood up and was counted for. He wasn't silent and inactive as, unfortunately, the world was in 1994. He stood up. He put his life on the line and said: I must have a voice for

the voiceless. He is an American hero whom I, with pleasure, am able to tell my children that I serve in the United States House of Representatives with an American hero, an American icon. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), an icon, a true American hero, a fighter for justice, and a man who is committed to Almighty God.

□ 1830

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York who not only has yielded me some time to speak on this issue, but I just want to observe that he has been one of the most remarkable persons to ever serve in this House, this exalted House of Representatives. He is a man who has made enormous contributions to the plight of those who need a voice, to those who need a heart, to those who need a spirit that will fight for them where they cannot fight for themselves. I know that Congressman GREGORY MEEKS has stood the test of the opposition to those who are denied human rights anywhere in the world, and I am so honored that he will allow me a few minutes to share with the Nation the sadness of the hour, but also to celebrate the resurgence of the Rwanda people.

The sadness of the hour is we come to the floor today, Mr. Speaker, to commemorate a very salient and sober observance. As was indicated by prior speakers, just 20 years ago this week the world witnessed one of the worst acts of violence since the end of World War II. It unfolded before our very eyes. Most of us can recall where we were, what we were doing, the life that we lived just 20 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am right now referring to the outbreak of violence just 20 years ago in a place that most of us had never heard of, a place called Rwanda. And now this place, Rwanda, is written in our psyches as one of the horror stories of our lives of our time. This outbreak of violence in Rwanda ultimately led to the death of over 800,000 ordinary men, women, boys, and girls. This is an atrocity that has been appropriately labeled and called and will go down in history as the Rwanda genocide. Just that word "genocide" should give us all pause, and all should strike an attentive ear whenever we hear that word "genocide" because the images that are conjured up in our minds are images of some of the most horrendous acts of man's inhumanity to man, of human's inhumanity to human beings.

Since the time of the Rwanda genocide, I want to congratulate the decent people, the justice-seeking people, the honorable people of Rwanda who have made great strides to rebuild their lives and to rebuild their country, to heal the deep, biting wounds, and to move forward as a nation.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Rwanda is being led by a President that 20 years ago would have been unimaginable, an ethnic Tutsi. President Paul Kagame has,

for the past 14 years, overseen Rwanda's rebirth and has made the world proud of Rwanda's incredible resurrection and progress.

At yesterday's memorial service in Rwanda, he offered these simple words of everlasting hope:

As we pay tribute to the victims, both the living and those who have passed, we also salute the unbreakable Rwandan spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, salute the Rwandan spirit and applaud the Rwandan people on just how far they have come in just a few years, just 20 years. At the same time that I applaud the Rwandan people, I admonish, I encourage, I plead, I ask, I beg the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda to continue their quest for justice and to bring those to trial, those who have, up to now, escaped the might of justice and the appeal of justice-seeking people throughout the world.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I must remind our own government that in 1994 we stood on this floor, in this Congress, in this Capitol, in this Nation, and we promised ourselves, we promised the world, we promised anyone who had ears to hear, that we would never, ever again allow such brutal violence to occur anywhere else in the world, that we had finally learned our lesson and that we would never have to relearn this awesome and brutal lesson. And yet, Mr. Speaker, we still see the same thing occurring, the same atrocities, the same murders and rapes, the same pillaging, the same acts of inhumane treatment toward fellow human beings. We bear witness that this same thing is again happening all over our world.

Whether Syria or South Sudan, our Nation, the United States of America, the American people, and the entire global community must rise up and stand up shoulder to shoulder and ensure that humanitarian rights are protected all over this world. As we have witnessed in Rwanda, global inaction has already led to genocide. Global inaction will always lead to genocide. We simply cannot idly stand by and allow genocide to continue in our world.

Mr. Speaker, I must close with a quote from the English poet John Donne, who said:

Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind.

I want to paraphrase Mr. Donne's quote and say that any human's death diminishes me, because I am involved in humankind.

Again, hats off to you, my honorable and humble colleague from the great State of New York. You don't surprise me being the chief sponsor of this particular moment in time in the history of this institution because, Mr. MEEKS, this is just simply another step for you, because when it comes to the history and when it comes to justice for people throughout the world, it is a step forward, and you are a stepper for mankind.

Mr. MEEKS. Thank you, Mr. RUSH. I thank you for having the broad shoulders that I stand on and for being here.

Let me wrap up. Over the last several months, thousands of Rwandans have watched as a torch symbolizing the memory of those who perished, known as the Flame of Remembrance, was passed hand to hand, village to village, across the nation. In a fitting climax to its journey, that torch finally arrived yesterday at the National Genocide Memorial beneath dark skies and a gentle rain. But the rain did not distinguish the flame, nor will it for the next 100 days. The Flame of Remembrance will burn in Rwanda's capital of Kigali and remind the world of the 100 days of violence which marred its streets 20 years ago. Let us work together to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that it never happens again and that we can live in peace.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1845

NEW BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LEASE AND PERMIT DATA

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the United States Department of Energy released its 2014 strategic plan, which reiterates how the President is committed to an all-of-the-above energy strategy.

I personally was pleased to hear the administration reiterate their commitment to expanding all of America's domestic energy resources, including fossil fuels, which is fundamental to the Nation's future economic security.

The report also outlined the administration's goal to "decouple our economy from the global oil market."

Unfortunately, the administration's policy continually falls short of their unbelievable rhetoric.

Just one example: since President Obama took office, total Federal oil production has declined 7.8 percent and Federal natural gas production has declined 21 percent. It is no wonder, for according to new data released this week from the Bureau of Land Management, Federal onshore oil and natural gas leases and permits are at the lowest levels in more than a decade.

Mr. Speaker, real energy security will take actually pursuing, rather than merely claiming, an all-of-the-above energy approach.

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is a deeply troubling matter that has come before our government here in the United States. Once again, Iran is at the bottom of it. They have shown since 1979, since President Carter basi-

cally was pushing for the ouster of the Shah, we turned on an ally who was not a good man necessarily, but we—well, actually, President Carter—hailed the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of peace.

What has been wrought—to use the words of Samuel F. B. Morse—has been years and years of terrorism in the hands of violent radical Islamic jihadists.

Then we get word that Iran has named one of the people involved in the original hostage-taking incident in Tehran in 1979 as its Ambassador to the U.N.

At this time, I want to recognize my very good friend from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), who has really taken the lead in an appropriate response from our House.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership in getting this time tonight so that we can talk about this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, last week, we learned something shocking and appalling. The Iranian government wants to appoint a terrorist as their Ambassador to the United Nations. A man who assisted in the 1979 terrorist attack on our embassy in Tehran. A man who helped hold American diplomats hostage for 444 days. This is a man that the supposedly moderate new government in Iran wants to represent Iran on American soil in New York City. This is unconscionable and this is unacceptable. It is time for all of us to speak up with one loud and unified voice against this injustice.

Amazingly, at this moment, the President of the United States does not have the legal authority to keep this man off of our shores. The President can deny visas to diplomats if they have been caught spying on ourselves or our allies, but he can't keep someone out of our country if they are a terrorist. They can be admitted as a diplomat and get a visa.

Last week, Senator TED CRUZ and I introduced legislation to fix this problem. Our bill would give the President the authority he needs to do the right thing and to deny this man a visa. Senator CRUZ received strong support from Democrats in the Senate like Senator CHUCK SCHUMER of New York. The bill passed the Senate unanimously last night 100-0. How many issues pass the Senate 100-0?

I am working here in the House to quickly move this bill forward so that we don't have an Iranian terrorist walking the streets of Manhattan with diplomatic immunity.

It is mind-boggling, but if Osama bin Laden himself had been named an Ambassador to the United Nations by somebody, the President would not have had the legal authority to deny him a visa. We have got to fix it. That is why this legislation is before us. The Cruz-Lamborn legislation would give the President the ability to do the right thing and to deny this Iranian terrorist a visa.

Time heals some wounds, but time should not cause amnesia. Letting this man into the country with all the pomp and circumstance of diplomatic immunity would cause pain to those who are hostages. It would jeopardize the safety and security of this Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and for House leadership to move it quickly to passage as soon as possible.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas once again for taking leadership and bringing this issue to the attention of the American people through this time here on the floor tonight.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend from Colorado.

In fact, when I heard that such an outrage was being suggested, I said to my staff, we have got to do something. I was told, and I should have suspected, my friend DOUG LAMBORN from Colorado was already out there, he already has a bill, H.R. 4357. I was brought a Dear Colleague letter accompanying that, and I said we have got to help our friend do what is right for America.

I was pleased that TED CRUZ was able to get that pushed through in the Senate. Frankly, it shows there is still hope for the Senate. That is encouraging. You look for hope where you can get it.

But I remember so well 1979–1980. I was in the Army at Fort Benning. This attack occurred and we were outraged. There was nobody I knew in the Army who was dying to go to Iran. But really everybody I knew at Fort Benning and other posts, we expected to go because it was an act of war.

Our embassy was attacked in Tehran, it was an act of war, and nothing really happened for 444 days. There was a failed rescue attempt. I still, Mr. Speaker, have asked from the floor before, and I wish somebody could verify for sure, but I had a friend from Fort Benning who had told me that the original plan for the rescue required that 12 helicopters would go 500 or so miles inland into Iran to a staging area there.

At the time they knew where the hostages were. There was still good intel. They knew where they were. So this was going to be an effort to rescue them. This was the original Delta Force. Our friend General Jerry Boykin, now at the Family Research Council, was one of the original Delta Force. I have talked to him about that time out there in the desert.

They were to rendezvous with some aircraft that would have supplies, things they needed. In order to make the trip, as General Boykin confirms, they knew they had to have six helicopters there make it that far inland.

What I would like to get substantiation on or just prove, that originally the military proposed, the joint military group proposed 12 helicopters to go in. Their reasoning, as a friend from Fort Benning pointed out—this is back when I was in the Army this was being told—the reasoning was when you go

across hundreds of miles of sand, desert, with turbine engines, that you run the risk of having a high loss rate of your helicopters.

So they asked for 12, thinking since six was absolutely essential to have at the staging area inside Iran, that they should allow for 50 percent loss of the helicopters. What I still want to find out, is it true that the 12 helicopters were proposed, but that the White House said: No, 12 would look like an invasion, so let's scale that back to eight. I was told the dialogue went: Well, if we have eight and we have four losses, then we only get there with four and there is no mission; if we don't do it now, we may not know where they move them. We really should go with 12. But I was told the White House said: No, we can't go with 12. We don't want to make it look like an invasion, scale it back to eight.

General Boykin confirmed that there were eight helicopters that made the trip. But when they got to the staging area, when it was clear that only five helicopters were going to make it, he said there was an automatic abort at that point. Unfortunately, as we know from the news of what happened, one of the choppers as it attempted to rise up, the pilot must have had vertigo—it is very easy to happen in the desert sand as the sand swirls around you—but whatever the reasoning, the helicopter slightly turned, the rotors went through the C-130, and we lost American lives out there on the desert floor at the staging area in Iran.

I don't fault anyone who was part of the Delta Force. They were some of the most heroic people America has produced. They were willing to risk it all, and some did give all in the effort to go after our hostages.

But whether the proposal was originally 12 and it was scaled back to eight, or whether the administration, the Commander in Chief, just said go with eight, either way the error was where the buck stops, at the top with the Commander in Chief. Because just like President Kennedy admitted after he withdrew the full air support that he had promised during the Bay of Pigs invasion, as he said afterwards: We should have gone ahead. We would have been better off doing a full-scale invasion instead of having something as embarrassing and humiliating as this—or words to that effect, is what I had read.

If you are going to rescue American lives, you commit whatever it takes. The military is always ready to commit whatever it takes.

Our problem comes in the chain of command usually at the very top. That is why it has been so tragic in Afghanistan that in a period of half the time of President George W. Bush being Commander in Chief, President Obama as Commander in Chief had around twice or so the fatalities and even more of injuries, debilitating serious injuries.

The rules of engagement are critical in a battle like that. Whether it is

going to rescue hostages, whether it is going to provide a peacekeeping mission, it is absolutely imperative that our military have the full authority to protect themselves, win whatever battle may be confronted, and come home.

The lesson that all too often is not learned from Vietnam is not that we should never get involved in foreign battles. The lesson is and should be, the one that has not been learned is this: if we are going to commit American men and women to combat, then give them authority to win and bring them home. That should be the lesson of Vietnam.

□ 1900

It should be the lesson of Iraq. It should be the lesson of Afghanistan, and yet, we still have people in Afghanistan who don't really understand why they are there, but don't want to be the last American to die in Afghanistan.

As we see surveys around the world indicating that the United States has lost tremendous respect—and in areas where our President, along with many of the rest of us thought, okay, we have a President who did a lot of growing and learning in an Islamic country as he has indicated.

So surely, he will help our relationships with and in Muslim countries; and yet, as you look at surveys in Muslim countries around the world, we are less respected now than we were under President and Commander in Chief George W. Bush, especially when you are dealing with radical Islamic leaders.

There are so many people in Iran. I have met some of them in surrounding countries, refugees from Iran, who verify that there are so many Iranian people—they love Americans, but clearly, their leadership does not.

It is a slap in the face for the Iranian leadership to think that they could get away—to think that we have such a weak Commander in Chief that they could send over someone who is a participant in an act of war, an international crime against humanity, attacking an embassy and taking hostages and mistreating those hostages; yet they thought they could get away with it.

If you look at what has been happening around the world, perhaps it is not that difficult to understand why Iran thought they could get away with something so heinous as to send a participant of the original international crime, an act of war of attacking our Embassy and holding hostages.

Well, some may say: this guy, we don't know that he was there when the Embassy was actually attacked.

But as I know from my judge days and prosecutor days—the Federal law, State laws I am aware of, and in the international circles—anyone who aids, encourages, and abets is considered a principal of the crime.

So that is what we have here, an arrogant, condescending slap in the face of the United States President, Congress, everyone who has any leadership

in this country, a show of no respect to send someone who is well-known to have participated, despite the efforts to minimize roles he may have had.

So why would they think they could do that? You look, gee, the Russians and the Chinese have taken the measure of our President. They know he is the Commander in Chief. They know how our government functions. Iran has done the same thing. Syria has done the same thing.

Others around the world have looked, and they saw, and I have even had some world leaders say: look, Mubarak—none of us really liked him—but he was your ally, and he gave you a longer period of peace on the Israeli border with Egypt than any other time; so we couldn't believe when you turned on your ally, you have written agreements with Mubarak. We don't understand how you could just toss aside an ally who has helped you so much.

People in other countries have said: we couldn't believe Qadhafi had blood on his hands; and yet, after 2003, he had some kind of conversion experience after he saw the U.S. go into Iraq.

He said: look, I am giving up my nukes, you can take them, you can come in and inspect whatever you want, and I will be your best friend in fighting terrorism.

As some other moderate Muslim leaders in the Middle East have said: he was your friend. As other leaders in the Middle East have said: he provided you more help and more information on terrorists than any other country but Israel.

So what did we do? We came after Qadhafi. We bombed his forces, and it seems pretty clear, without the United States' assistance, Qadhafi would have stayed in power. We would still be getting information on terrorism in the Middle East from Qadhafi and his people.

We would have four people that didn't die in Benghazi, and terrorism wouldn't be so profoundly manifesting itself in north Africa and the Middle East, but this administration turned on someone who had turned into a friend to the United States, an enemy of terrorism.

We have moderate Muslim friends in Afghanistan who actually defeated the Taliban for us. My heart breaks for my friend Masood and others who risked their lives to fight the Taliban, who defeated the Taliban under the leadership of General Dostum, who some now in this administration call a war criminal. He fought the Taliban like the Taliban fights. He defeated them. He did us a great favor.

The Taliban was acknowledged to have been in disarray and completely defeated, and then we decide to nation-build. I know this is not the fault of President Obama, it was done before he came in, but we decided to nation-build.

We sent tens of thousands of troops into Iran, whereas we had only had less than 500 there at the time that the Taliban was routed.

How could we do that? Well, we provided them weapons, we gave them air cover, we gave them intel. We had embedded special ops and intelligence, and we let them do the fighting, and we whipped the Taliban by letting the enemy of our enemy defeat our enemy.

Now, this administration refers to them as war criminals? They were our allies, they were our friends. They defeated the Taliban. So we mistreat our friends who risked their lives fighting our enemy for us—and for themselves, make no mistake.

Then this administration is constantly reaching out to the Taliban: we want to talk, we want to sit down with you—and offered at one time to buy them luxurious offices, international offices—if you will just sit down, you don't even have to agree to reach an agreement, just to sit down with us and talk; we may let a lot of your people who have murdered Americans go free if you just sit down and talk with us.

Then the Chinese have seen how we have turned on allies and reached out to our enemies. They have had their eyes on certain places near China, South China Sea, other places surrounding China, they have had their eye on places, just like Russia has.

Now, they see the United States turning on allies, embracing enemies. They ask the same questions. They are bound to ask the same questions some of our allies have expressed: Are you still fighting against terror? Because they are still fighting you and we can't tell that you are helping in the fight anymore.

So China starts making moves they never would have made 5 years ago because they wouldn't have wanted to risk a U.S. response; and Russia wouldn't have made the move 5 years ago, but they have counted the cost, they have measured the leader of the United States of America, just like Khrushchev did in the early 1960s. They have figured: we can move on Crimea, and the United States will do nothing.

That is why they laughed when the President announced that he was going to put sanctions on some of the Russian leaders. They were shocked. That is all you are going to do? That is it? Wow. Let's move some more troops to Ukrainian border. Maybe we can grab some more of Ukraine, and the U.S. will continue to do nothing.

Weakness is provocative. It has always been; it will always be. I knew I owed 4 years to the Army, and I would do that before I did anything else, so I majored in what I loved, history. There are so many lessons repeated over and over in history.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, it was shocking to hear an educated Secretary of State that knew that you pronounced Genghis Khan as "Genghis Khan" actually make the statement that the Russians were making a 19th century move on Crimea, when history dictates that what the Russians did in moving on Crimea, an area they have had their eyes on and wanted to take

is—yes, it is 19th century, it is 20th century, it is 21st century, it will be 22nd century if the Lord tarries. It was 18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13. It has been in every century.

You go back to the Dark Ages, whether you say that is 500 to a 1000 A.D. or whether you say it is specifically 476 to 800 A.D., whatever you call the Dark Ages, these were the kind of moves that were made then. People made moves—assaultive moves on other people, places, and things because there is evil in this world.

Mr. Speaker, there is the good that our Founders acknowledged, that God put there. It is why they said we are endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights because they knew there was a Creator, that they knew there was evil in the world, and they set up as many obstacles to power grabs in this country as they could.

They felt pretty comfortable that Congress would never allow either the Supreme Court or the President to usurp legislative power without reining them in. It is time that we did that.

My dear friend, DOUG LAMBORN, produced H.R. 4357. It says this:

The purpose is to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has engaged in espionage activities against the United States, poses a threat to the United States, and other purposes.

It goes on to say:

A bill to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has engaged in espionage activities against the United States, poses a threat to United States national security interests, or has engaged in a terrorist activity against the United States.

Then it goes on in detail, as far as changing section 407(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, in order to make it possible where we could deny entrance to Iran's proposed U.N. Ambassador. It is time we did that.

There was a story from Fox News, dated March 31, that is entitled, "One-time hostage of Iranian militants urges denial of visa to new Iran envoy involved in siege."

□ 1915

This was written by Eric Shawn. It says:

Hostages captured after the 1979 siege on the U.S. Embassy in Tehran are seen in this undated file photo.

Former American hostage Barry Rosen, held by student extremists at the U.S. Embassy in Tehran for more than a year, said Monday it would be an "outrage" and "disgrace" if Washington gave a visa to one of the militants recently named by Iran as its new U.N. Ambassador.

"It may be a precedent, but if the President and the Congress don't condemn this act by the Islamic Republic, then our captivity and suffering for 444 days at the hands of Iran was for nothing," Rosen said. "He can never set foot on American soil."

This is a quote from Rosen.

He also said:

It's a disgrace if the United States Government accepts Aboutalebi's visa as Iranian Ambassador to the U.N.

Rosen was the Embassy's press attache who was blindfolded and held at gunpoint, along with 51 fellow Americans taken hostage. In a statement to FOX News, Rosen demanded that the Obama administration deny a visa to Aboutalebi to prevent him from taking up Tehran's U.N. post.

We need to take action. We hold the purse strings. We need to cut off any funding for any effort that might be undertaken to grant this international terrorist a visa so that he can come on American soil and have diplomatic immunity.

So I am quite proud of my friend from Colorado, Mr. LAMBORN and I have traveled to Israel together. I have seen him conduct himself in international settings in ways that should make Colorado proud of him, as well as the United States.

My friend TED CRUZ got a bill through the Senate that passed 100-0. As reported by the AP April 7:

The Senate approved a bill Monday to bar a man with ties to the 1979 Iranian hostage crisis who's been tapped to be Iran's Ambassador to the United Nations from entering the United States.

By voice vote, Republicans and Democrats united behind the legislation sponsored by Senator Ted Cruz, Republican of Texas, that reflected congressional animosity toward Tehran and its selection of Hamid Aboutalebi. Iran's envoy's choice was a member of a Muslim student group that held 52 American hostages for 444 days in the 1979 seizure of the Embassy in Tehran.

The "nomination is a deliberate and unambiguous insult to the United States," Cruz said in remarks on the Senate floor in which he describes Iran's anti-Americanism since 1979, and added, "This is not the moment for diplomatic niceties."

I am very proud of my friend TED CRUZ, the Senator from Texas. This is the way we need to respond to Iran's slap in the face of the United States.

Again, if you look at the way this administration has reached out to Iran, they have laughed openly and said yes, they were negotiating, and yes, they reached a preliminary agreement with this White House, but they are not stopping anything in the way of developing nuclear weapons. They made that clear. They are not abandoning their nukes.

So what have we done? We gave them a free space in which to keep developing nukes. We don't know what they have been doing behind the scenes because there have not even been inspections in all the facilities that we know of, and they brag that they are not abandoning anything.

And what else did the administration do? The administration eased up and allowed them billions of dollars in relief from the sanctions which, no doubt, would help them pursue nuclear weapons as they move forward.

It is just tragic why and how this administration is giving the impression to nations like Iran that we will not stand up to them. But, again, look at what we did as a nation. We reelected President Obama, knowing that before the election he had turned to the leadership from Russia and basically said: Tell

Vladimir Putin that I will have a lot more flexibility after the election.

People elected the President, knowing that he had telegraphed to the Russians that he would show a lot more weakness and would be able to give the Russians a lot more of what they wanted after the election in 2012.

If you look at this administration's activities after the election in 2008, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was sent over with a goofy-looking button that they thought had, in Russian, "reset," when, actually, I don't know what that says. She thought it said "reset." It didn't say that. And we embarrassed ourselves.

But the message was very clear because the Russians, and Putin in particular, knew that the reason that relationships have been strained was that, toward the end of the Bush administration, the Russians moved on Georgia, and the reaction was swift from President Bush. He didn't do as much as I might have thought should be done, but he was embarrassed. He was bound to have been embarrassed because he said he looked to this man and knew that he was a man of peace, or words to that effect, and it had to feel like a bit of a betrayal to President Bush when he moved on Georgia.

The Russian activities of moving on Georgia, totally abandoning and betraying the outreach by the Bush administration, put a significant chill on U.S.-Russian relations. That is why they were chilled. That is why diplomatic relations were so stiff at the time that this administration took over.

So when you know that it was the Russian invasion and move on Georgia that caused a strain in relations, to the Russians, when this administration says, Hey, we are really sorry for the way we acted in the past; we want a new relationship; we want to hit a reset button or whatever we put in Russian on this thing, we want to start over, the message was clear to Vladimir Putin: we're sorry that we were offended when you broke your word to us and invaded Georgia; we're sorry that you were an aggressor, you attacked and invaded and went into a neighboring country. This administration was apologizing for the Russians being that aggressive, and the message was clear that we are not the country we once were. And the message was sent to go ahead and take what you think you can, and he has.

Countries around the world are looking at us. We know we still have the greatest military. Despite all the cuts, it is still the greatest military in the world. And yet, if you don't have leaders willing to show strength, then people will take advantage. It is not a 19th century historical action; it is a 21st and every century since man has been on this planet.

Some have asked, gee, if these inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness really are inalienable, why do all people around the

world not have them? And the answer, I think, is because yes, they were an inheritance bequeathed to us by our Creator; but just as any inheritance, if the heir does not claim that inheritance and have a willingness to protect it and fight for it and maintain it, then you won't keep it.

Thus, when Ben Franklin was purportedly asked, "What have you given us?" he replied, "A republic, if you can keep it."

Muslim moderates are concerned because they see the United States trying to embrace radicals. Again, I am so proud of the moderate Muslims in Egypt in joining, literally and figuratively, arm in arm, hand in hand with Christians and secularists in Egypt and coming to the street in millions and millions and millions and demanding a leader who would not usurp power that was not his in the constitution, demanding his removal, demanding a constitution that would allow them to impeach a leader like Morsi had become as a Muslim Brother. They made clear: we don't want radical Islamist leaders or people in our government because they have one goal, and that is taking overall power, subjugating everyone else, including moderate Muslims and Christians.

That is why it was so ironic to hear one of the Justices of the Supreme Court, in effect, saying just pay the tax and then you have got your religious beliefs, because that is a shari'a law belief. And I know she is not aware of that. But actually, under shari'a law, if you are a Christian, you can pay a tax and subjugate yourself humbly before the Muslim government and they will allow you to practice your religion so long as you remain subjugated to shari'a and to the Muslim leaders.

But in this Nation, you are not supposed to have to pay a tax or a fine in order to practice your religious beliefs. In Egypt—God bless those people—they didn't want to do that either, so they got rid of the Muslim Brother leaders.

What else did they do, Mr. Speaker? They declared the Muslim Brotherhood as a terrorist organization. And if one reads the opinion from the Dallas Federal court and also from the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in the Holy Land Foundation trial, it seems pretty clear the evidence is there that Muslim Brotherhood should be accepted as a terrorist organization.

□ 1930

And groups like CAIR, who have such a powerful influence in this administration, who can call and have an intelligence briefing shut down at Langley, as they have, who can call and complain that the training materials at the FBI offend them and have them purged so those FBI training materials no longer offend a front organization for the Muslim Brotherhood, as found by the Dallas court and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Now there is a story from England. The BBC news reports "David Cameron Orders Review of Muslim Brotherhood":

Prime Minister David Cameron has commissioned a review of the Muslim Brotherhood's UK activity, No. 10 says.

The Muslim Brotherhood is an Islamist movement which has been declared a terrorist group by Egypt's government.

Recent press reports have suggested members have moved to London to escape a crackdown in Cairo, where the group backs ousted President Mohammed Morsi.

Well, they had that in common with at least one or two of our U.S. Senators who went over there to back Morsi.

In any event, the article goes on:

Number 10 said the review would examine the group's philosophy and activities, and the government's policy toward it.

According to the Times, it was prompted by evidence received by the government that Muslim Brotherhood leaders met in London last year to plan their response to events in Egypt.

The Prime Minister's official spokesman said that the "main conclusions" of the review, which is due to be completed by the summer, would be made public.

Asked what had triggered the review, he said the government had received a succession of reports from its Embassies in the region, building up a picture which the Prime Minister believed should be examined.

But No. 10 does not provide any details on which bodies are to be involved in the review.

The Muslim Brotherhood was founded in Egypt, but now operates in many states and has influenced other Islamic movements around the world with its model of political activism combined with Islamic charity work.

While the Brotherhood—and it has the Arabic name—says it supports democratic principles, one of its stated aims is to create a state ruled by Islamic law or shari'a.

Its most famous slogan, used worldwide, is "Islam is the solution."

The organization's backing installed Mr. Morsi as Egypt's first civilian president in 2012, but he was ousted—and this is the same mistake that CNN and this administration makes; they called it a military coup last year—after widespread street protests.

As the millions and millions and millions of people in Egypt made clear, millions more than even Morsi claimed voted for him, it was not a military coup. This was an uprising by the people of Egypt demanding the Constitution be followed, and the ouster of a president who was grabbing power at scary speed, and many knew if they didn't move at the time they did, a year later would be too late. He would be like dictators often are, elected, then seize all power, and you can't ever get rid of them.

In any event, this article says:

In December, the new Egyptian government declared the Muslim Brotherhood a terrorist group after blaming it for an attack on a police station that killed 16 people.

A Downing Street spokesman said in a statement: "The Prime Minister has commissioned an internal government review into the philosophy and activities of the Muslim Brotherhood and the government's policy toward the organization."

So, anyway, it is interesting, Egypt has declared the Muslim Brotherhood to be a terrorist organization, and they should know better than any nation in the world.

I thank God for the Egyptians that rose up. Estimates are a third of the

population went to the streets to demand removal. And I didn't know till I was over there last fall, they didn't have any provision in their Constitution for impeachment, so they needed a constitution where they could impeach a president who usurps power that is not his under the Constitution.

Now, England is taking a look to see if they shouldn't declare them terrorist organizations.

The reason we can anticipate that, in the near future, this administration will not declare the Muslim Brotherhood to be a terrorist organization is because they get advice from two front organizations, as the courts have said, of the Muslim Brotherhood. That would be the Council on American-Islamic Relations, CAIR, and I can see them, their building from my window, so they have got a good spot to keep watch over Capitol Hill, and also, ISNA, the Islamic Society of North America. And its leader is Imam Magid, who, as far as I know, is frequently giving advice, continued advice to the State Department, the White House on anything to do with Islam.

We know that the Egyptian paper had reported in December of 2012, when the Muslim Brotherhood was running the government, that six Muslim Brothers were in very key and top positions of power and advice within the Obama administration. They heralded that as a great thing for the Muslim Brothers to have that much influence in Washington.

So there shouldn't be a great deal of wonder at why this administration, with one of those individuals, reported an Egyptian paper, being a top adviser in homeland security, charged with keeping us safe, that we have, according to the Egyptian paper, a Muslim Brother, Mr. Elibiary, who was given a secret clearance by Janet Napolitano, and given access to confidential material or secret material. And we, apparently, get advice from this man, whose business started a foundation, or he started a foundation called the Freedom and Justice Foundation.

Most of us would say freedom and justice? That is great. He believes in freedom and justice. Until you look up the meaning of freedom and justice. Under shari'a law, freedom and justice means freedom to worship Allah only, and justice only under shari'a law. And so it is no big surprise that the Muslim Brotherhood political party in Egypt called itself the Freedom and Justice Party.

But if there are enough leaders here in the United States that know what is good for us, we will see what Egypt has done, what England is doing. And even Russia has noticed that radical Islam is an enemy. They have even tried to warn us, but found we don't take warnings well.

We should declare the Muslim Brotherhood to be a terrorist organization.

THOUGHTS ON THE CAUSATION OF THE FORT HOOD SHOOTINGS

Now, that brings me to another point about the first Fort Hood shooting that was clearly an act of terrorism by an enemy combatant.

Even though this administration calls it workplace violence, it was an act of war by a warrior for radical Islam. And he was able to kill the 13 people, Nadal Hasan, for more than one reason. One was, political correctness kept superior commissioned officers from calling it like they saw it because they didn't want to be called some racist or Islamaphobe, the term that the OIC, the Islamic council, had put together to try to intimidate people from recognizing the danger that radical Islam was.

They didn't want to be called Islamaphobe, and they knew, going all the way up the chain of command, that they might be looked upon badly if they reported this man for what they saw, not a moderate Muslim, but a man that was a potential problem, a person who was being radicalized.

Another problem was that the people we entrust with rocket-propelled grenades, with tanks, with all kinds of weapons, with helicopters that can fire blistering rounds thousands of meters away and kill hundreds and thousands of people, they have that much authority, that much ability, that much power, we trust them with these tremendous weapons that kill people, and yet, we tell them, but we don't trust you to have a pistol with you on a military installation.

So just as when a killer walked into a cafeteria in Killeen, Texas, that adjoins Fort Hood years ago, he knew no one would have a gun there, and so he killed a lot of people, including a woman's parents. She had put her gun in her glove compartment, and knew she could have saved her parents if she had been able to keep her weapon.

So she fought for and obtained passage, as a new State representative, for a concealed-carry permit. So we now have concealed-carry because of that first shooting incident in Killeen.

But this administration didn't learn anything when they called that shooting workplace violence, didn't learn anything about reporting potential threats, and so more people died at Fort Hood.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we said, you know what?

Military Members, men and women who are putting your lives at risk for us, with whom we have entrusted weapons of mass destruction, we are going to trust you with a firearm. So if you will get a permit, and they show they are qualified—I know my 4 years in the Army, every year we had to go qualify—make sure they are qualified with the firearm they have, and let them carry firearms.

I started to put it in the bill that I drafted, that they would be concealed, but I think we should leave that to the

commanders. So we, just as I was coming over here, got the draft from legislative counsel and will be filing it this week.

It is a bill to authorize qualified members of the Armed Forces to carry firearms on military bases and installations, and for other purposes. And this act may be cited as the Save Our Soldiers Act, or the SOS Act.

It does apply, would apply to all soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, Coast Guard. It applies to all of our uniformed military. And it says, in general, any qualified member of the Armed Forces may carry a firearm on a military base or installation. Then it goes through to set forth how you go about applying for the permit to do that.

If we can trust them with weapons of mass destruction, we ought to be able to trust them with a pistol, with a firearm.

□ 1945

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this gets legs and that we will get this passed through the House with widespread bipartisan support. Especially in this election year, people seem to be more acutely attentive to what their constituents think, so that is why I know it would be a bipartisanly-passed bill if we will bring it up this year and then send it to the Senate.

Our friend from Nevada, Senator REID, may not want to bring it up; but then if he won't bring it up, then the only other alternative would be for voters to turn out members of Mr. REID's party, so he wouldn't be the Majority Leader.

Then we could get someone who would bring that bill to the floor, so that we don't have another attack at Fort Hood or another Navy Yard or somewhere else and have to go: Gee, what could we have done?

Some of the rest of us would repeat, for the umpteenth time: you should let people who are qualified to carry firearms carry firearms.

We have seen, over and over, killers go to where they know firearms are prohibited, like the Colorado shooter going to a theater farther away than one close because those that were closer allowed firearms to be carried inside.

It would be terrific if we could do that for our military, and I know there are some commanders who take the nod from our Commander in Chief and say: oh, we don't think that is a good idea.

But it is a good idea. It is something we should do, and it is time we moved in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE HUDSON RIVER SCHOOL OF PAINTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair rec-

ognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, since my election to the United States House of Representatives in 1988, I have been immensely proud to be a part of New York's congressional delegation.

My colleagues from New York and I—both Democratic and Republican—have united many times to fight for causes that are critical for our State. In the wake of terrible tragedies, like September 11, 2001, and, most recently, Hurricane Sandy, we have come together to perform our most important duties as Members of Congress, which is our obligation to do what is best for the people of New York.

It is important, though, that we don't solely band together in times of tragedy; rather we must also gather in celebration of the people and occasions that make our Empire State a great State. That is why I am delighted to rise today in recognition of the Hudson River School of painters, the first school of art indigenous to the United States.

The Hudson River runs through my district and the districts of many of my colleagues, some of whom will be speaking here today as well; and we are very, very proud of that river and proud of what it represents.

The Hudson River School of Art is comprised of a group of 19th century painters, including Thomas Cole, Frederic Edwin Church, Asher Brown Durand, Jasper Francis Cropsey, Sanford Robinson Gifford, Albert Bierstadt, John Frederick Kensett, George Inness, Worthington Whittredge, and Thomas Moran.

Today, these artists' paintings can be found in the United States Capitol, the National Gallery of Art, and the State Department, as well as the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City, the Art Institute of Chicago, and the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston.

Next to me are portraits of two of the Hudson River School's most celebrated painters, Jasper Francis Cropsey and Thomas Cole, the father of the Hudson River School.

Now, the artist who did these sculptures is Greg Wyatt, my friend who is with us today, whose primary medium of artistic expression is cast bronze, and I would like for everybody to see these because they are truly magnificent and represent the greatness of our State and the greatness of the Hudson River.

On the third easel—right here—is Cropsey's 1860 masterpiece "Autumn on the Hudson." It is truly beautiful, just as this portrait shows.

As its name suggests, some of the Hudson River School's most notable works portray the majesty of New York's Hudson River Valley. However, the Hudson River painters capture the grandeur of a variety of New York's national treasures, and, again, I am proud to represent part of the Hudson Valley.

From the Hudson Valley's lushness in Durand's "The Beeches," to the maj-

esty of the Catskills in Gifford's "A Gorge in the Mountains," to the tranquility of the ocean in Kensett's "Eaton's Neck, Long Island," the Hudson River School brilliantly encapsulated New York's diverse, yet unparalleled beauty.

I rise today not only to celebrate the Hudson River School's contributions to America's artistic canon, but also to the environment they so beautifully immortalize.

Hudson River School paintings helped Americans across the Nation understand the natural magnificence found across distant corners of the U.S. This understanding, in turn, helped nurture the idea that such magnificence ought to be preserved for future generations.

This idea culminated in 1916 with the creation of the National Park System and persisted into the 1960s when an environmentalist used Hudson River School paintings to demonstrate the need for legislation, such as the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, to protect America's stunning resources.

How glad we are that this Congress passed those laws. It follows then that the Hudson River School illustrates not only what art can do for the individual spirit, but also for the health of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the residents of New York and the United States might gain an appreciation for the Hudson River School and its tremendous impact on our Nation and its culture. To help show our appreciation, I have introduced House Resolution 480, honoring the Hudson River School painters for their contributions to the United States.

As a New Yorker, I am truly grateful to these artists for immortalizing the pristine beauty of New York's past. In the forthcoming speeches, my colleagues from New York will highlight their own appreciation for the Hudson River School and its invaluable contributions to our Nation.

I want to also add, Mr. Speaker, that we have a number of people who have journeyed here from New York to celebrate these contributions and witness this Special Order.

Among those is our distinguished former colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman Maurice Hinchey, my good friend. I welcome Maurice, his wife, and his daughter back to Washington and all the people here today, including Greg Wyatt, Barnabas McHenry, and so many other wonderful people.

I now yield to my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in recognition of the accomplishments of the painters that are so prominent that are part of the Hudson River School of painting, and I do want to thank our colleague, Representative ENGEL, the gentleman from New York, for hosting this Special Order on the House floor to honor the 19th century Hudson River School of painting.

There are so many who cherish this institution, including, as was just mentioned, our former colleague, Representative Maurice Hinchey, who I see seated in the gallery, along with his family.

Certainly, he represented the Hudson River Valley region of New York in such fine fashion and with a great appreciation for the arts and for cultural education.

The school is also cherished by individuals like Barnabas McHenry who, as chair of the Palisades Interstate Park Commission, understands the value of this great school; and Greg Wyatt who, as you have seen, is a sculptor and has produced great work as director of the Academy of Art, also at Newington-Cropsey Foundation, and at Hastings-on-Hudson; and so many who believe in the message that is sent forth by this great institution.

The Hudson River School of painting was the first uniquely American style of painting. The school's style of painting was popularized in the 1820s and lasted for much of the 19th century. You already heard many of the prominent painters listed by Representative ENGEL in his comments. Today, we are here to honor their contribution to our region, to our State of New York, and to this Nation.

The Hudson River School of painting was founded in upstate New York in the Hudson River Valley and the nearby Catskill Mountains. The Hudson River School's landscapes capture the natural and rural beauty of my home State of New York on canvas, including the majestic and mighty waters of that great region.

The Hudson River Valley has always had a special importance for our Nation. It was the pathway for early settlers to begin the westward movement that expanded our Nation's borders. To this day, we celebrate the Hudson River School of painting across the country and continue to do so in areas like Albany, New York, the capital region of New York.

At the Albany Institute of History and Art, one of the oldest museums in the country, many of the works from the Hudson River School artists are on display. Last week, I had the privilege of visiting the institute of history and art and made certain that I stopped by to view the several paintings that are on display by these magnificent artists.

One of the paintings that caught my eye and is near and dear to many is that of Jasper Cropsey's "Dawn of Morning, Lake George," which is pictured here beside me and captures the untouched beauty of Lake George.

Although the painting illuminates a quieter and distant time, many of the residents of the capital region continue to visit and enjoy the beauty of Lake George today.

Lake George is the largest lake in the Adirondacks and is within the Adirondacks State Park Preserve in upstate New York. The Adirondacks Pre-

serve was established in 1892 by the State of New York and covers more than 6 million acres of protected areas.

Cropsey's "Dawn of Morning, Lake George" captures the serenity that he imagined once existed and reminds us of the spectacular sight of nature, including our trees, the mountains, and the waters.

In addition to capturing the beauty of New York, over time, the Hudson River School artists began traveling more widely, eventually painting scenes throughout New England, the American West, Western Europe, north Africa, the Middle East, and South America.

The paintings of the American West were particularly popular. These realistic scenes of what was then, essentially, foreign land to most of the American people sparked the imagination and echoed the voices of the growing grassroots conservation movement, illustrating the need to preserve the wonders of our natural American landscape.

In fact, many landscapes of the Hudson River School were used to support the creation of the first national parks. Inspired in part by these paintings, the National Park System has been a significant part of our environmental inheritance, protecting some of America's most iconic and majestic places. I have always believed that our national parks embody the history and heritage that make America unique.

Personally, I grew up in Amsterdam, New York, in the heart of the scenic Mohawk Valley of New York. My upbringing instilled in me a strong concern for the health of our environment and an appreciation for the delicacy of natural ecosystems and our native wildlife.

As someone who believes that we must leave our children and grandchildren with a rich and enduring environmental inheritance, I am especially grateful for the role that the Hudson River School of painting served and will continue to serve in inspiring our Nation to preserve our land and to preserve our water.

For many generations to come, the American people will have the opportunity to view these breathtaking paintings and will be reminded why we must continue to preserve America's richness of natural beauty.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks by urging our colleagues and the public to recognize the Hudson River School of painting and the legacy forged by its artists. While the school has many ties to my home State and our capital region of New York, we can all appreciate the contributions made to this mighty Nation.

I would also like to thank our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), for his admirable work to promote and honor the Hudson River School of painting. Again, I thank him for this opportunity to proclaim the greatness of this great school of artists.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I now yield to our next speaker, the Representative from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt once said:

All my life, I have dreamed of going back to my home on the Hudson River. It was the center of the world.

He was referring to his habit of, late at night, of remembering being a child, before he was stricken with polo, before he was President, before he was burdened with the awesome responsibilities of his office during a time of war.

□ 2000

Being a child in the Hudson River meant sledding down a hill behind Hyde Park and feeling totally free. And he remembered that, as a President, to forget the burdens of his office and to remember the miracle and dream of his youth. Those of us who are blessed to represent the Hudson Valley understand that the Hudson Valley writes its beauty on our personalities and on our very souls. It inscribes us with its timeless beauty. And as it flows on endlessly by, we are reminded of the fleeting nature of our service and of our very lives.

A group of artists, including Thomas Cole, Asher Brown Durand, Jasper Francis Cropsey, and Frederic Edwin Church, somehow by hiking, sketching, and experiencing the Hudson River Valley found a way to translate what it means to those of us who live, work, and raise our families there into these permanent, lasting images. And our own modern-day genius, Greg Wyatt, has found a way to capture them. So we pause here tonight to honor that.

Drawing inspiration from our natural environment, these artists began painting scenes and now sculpting images. From across New York and our country, Asher Brown Durand, one of the original founders of the school, has one of the most beautiful pieces anyone will ever create of Beacon, New York. It is called "Beacon Hills on the Hudson River." It was painted across the river in Newburgh in 1852. Today, my office in Newburgh looks out at that same image, at that same beauty.

Frederic Church was one of the first to capture Niagara Falls back in 1857. Within 2 weeks of its debut, his piece had lured 100,000 visitors to pay 25 cents apiece to view it.

Not only did the Hudson River School influence the modern-day environmental conservation movement, but these paintings actually inspired the establishment of our National Park System in the early part of the 20th century, which was, of course, formed by President Teddy Roosevelt. Teddy Roosevelt couldn't have spoken more true words when he said:

There are no words that can tell the hidden spirit of the wilderness, that can reveal its mystery, its melancholy, and its charm.

But, again, our painters from the Hudson Valley found that hidden spirit

and that charm that Franklin and Teddy Roosevelt both remembered.

Dating back 100 years, my neighbors in the Hudson Valley take great pride in our natural resources and protecting and conserving this unique home for us and for our children and for generations to come.

I want to take just a minute to recognize my predecessor and our former colleague, Congressman Maurice Hinchey, and his family who have joined us here tonight. When you follow Maurice Hinchey in the Congress, you have some very big shoes to fill. And I have heard a lot about Congressman Hinchey and his service, and I always enjoy the stories because it sets for me an example of what I want to do in this body.

After Congressman Hinchey sacrificed for his country as a Navy sailor, as my own father did, he became a respected State lawmaker, and he proudly served here for two decades. My neighbors in the Hudson Valley know that he worked tirelessly for them, for economic justice and equal opportunity, because he believed that this government should work for everyone, including someone like him who grew up in a working class family and spent some time working in a factory, because our country, as Congressman Hinchey understood, is better off when leadership like his supports ordinary Americans, people like him who served in our military, our veterans, our working and middle class families who struggle to put food on the table and pay the bills but who can also appreciate the beauty of the environment and the timeless wonder of places like the Hudson Valley.

Congressman Hinchey played a critical role in the modern environmental movement even before it was widely recognized as important. Back in 1996 when I was working for President Clinton, Congressman Hinchey was authoring legislation that the President signed into law that established the Hudson Valley National Heritage Area. Because of Mr. Hinchey's leadership, the Hudson Valley National Heritage Area currently links over 100 individual sites, from Saratoga to Westchester, while showcasing the Hudson Valley's unique role in American history and development.

I want to commend Barnabas McHenry who is with us here today who has dedicated so much of his life to that same mission. Because of their leadership, my children and my grandchildren will see and be able to treasure the Hudson Valley's unique and incredible scenic, historic, agricultural, and natural wonders.

Congressman Hinchey always made sure that we remember the rich contributions of the Hudson River School of painters. Congressman Hinchey knows, like many of us do, that there is no place in the country that compares to the Hudson Valley, and those of us lucky enough to live there are not surprised that it was the birthplace of

America's first and greatest school of art.

In closing, let me just say that not long ago, a friend of mine came over to my home, which is across from West Point and Cold Spring, and actually looks down the Hudson River towards Garrison and south towards the Bear Mountain Bridge. I walked him up to the property, and the sun was going down. A short while later after he left, he sent a note and he said:

Sean, I once saw a sunset like that in a Frederic Church painting, and I thought he made it up. But when I saw it with my own eyes at your house, I understood for the first time what inspired these great geniuses to try to capture the wonder and beauty that is the Hudson River Valley for all time.

We honor their success in doing so tonight, and we honor those who continue that legacy who join us here tonight. Thank you on behalf of a grateful Hudson Valley and a grateful Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from referring to occupants in the gallery.

The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

THE FOUR PRINCIPLES OF CONSERVATISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized by you to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I appreciate this privilege to do so. It is something that I would encourage a lot of the Members to participate in and express the wishes of their constituents and their opinions here on the floor so that not only you can turn an ear and listen to this presentation here tonight, but also so that it inspires dialogue all across America.

We will remain a free country and we can remain a constitutional Republic if we have open debate and open dialogue and if the values of the American people remain consistent with our roots.

I would first, Mr. Speaker, start out with listening to the dialogue of the gentleman who spoke ahead of me, and I would note that his statement that there are people that went ahead of him and his family that are blue collar, it seems to me to be maybe a generation removed from the real America that most of it is blue collar. And I think it is important to note that this country that we are is not going to continue to prosper unless we have people whom people respect and honor and

who produce goods and services that have a marketable value here at home.

For those that get paid to pontificate—I, among them, okay—that is an important function also. For those who get paid to sit on the couch, that is not so important a function. But those that produce goods and services that have a marketable value here and abroad are the ones that grow our economy. In the private sector, it allows us to be competitive with the countries around the world. I think of my neighbors, many of whom are engaged in agriculture and how we compete with the most competitive economy in the world and we compete in a favorable way and we set the pace. We set the pace in productivity. We set the pace in efficiency. We set the pace in quality and in food safety. That is the circle around my neighborhood that you can see in any direction looking out from my house.

I am proud of those neighbors who produce those goods and services that have a marketable value here at home. A lot of that, most of it is the kind of thing we would call blue-collar work. I am impressed by the professionals that come here to Congress.

I came from the construction world, hands-on, in the ditch, shovel in hand, grease gun, wrench, steering wheel, yes, pencil and calculator from the lowest guy on the totem pole to the guy who started a company to now a second-generation King Construction Company. We have been engaged in this economy for I believe this will be our 40th season that we are engaged in now.

You see the flow of the economy, and you have respect for those who put their hands, their back, and their mind to work every day. I appreciate, also, a great deal these values of America, the roots of who we are as a people.

I was observing this morning, as I was getting ready to leave my place, that there was an individual who was interviewed on FOX this morning in their morning show by Steve Doocy, and it was Mallory Factor, an author I happen to know, an individual I count as a friend. He laid out the four principles of conservatism, and I thought it was a useful thing. I took the notes down and put them in my pocket because I believe he is exactly and succinctly right that this country needs to be rooted in those principles of conservatism. Without them, we are cast adrift.

Here are the four principles that he laid out:

The first one is respect for the tradition and wisdom of our past generations. That is a fairly succinct way of saying our Founding Fathers got it right. They laid down a foundation, a foundation in faith, free enterprise, and fidelity that has been the foundation for America becoming the unchallenged greatest Nation in the world. And if we are to stay that way, we need to remain respectful to the traditions and wisdom of past generations.

The second one is a rule of law. Mr. Speaker, you have heard me speak often and consistently about the rule of law. Lady Justice is often portrayed as blind. The statue of Lady Justice is of her holding the scales of justice, perfectly balanced scales of justice, weighed equally on either side. But Lady Justice is blindfolded because she doesn't see class or race or ethnicity or sex. She sees simply here is a human being before the court to be treated the same as any other human being, regardless of where they might sit in the social stratification by wealth, by race, by ethnicity, by sex, whatever the qualities might be. Whatever the qualifications might be, Lady Justice is blind, and the rule of law must apply to everyone equally. That is number two.

The third one is the belief in an individual freedom and liberty. And I will go a little further than Mr. Factor in that these rights come from God. Our Founding Fathers understood, articulated, and wrote: We hold these truths to be self-evident, all men—and that means men and women in the vernacular—are created equal, and they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.

It is an individual belief, the belief in individual freedom and liberty—not a freedom that is granted to you by government, not one that is bestowed upon you by the sovereign or the king, but this God-given individual liberty that comes from God that we then entrust from the people to the government. We loan our sovereign rights to the government to organize our society.

Government doesn't have the power. It is we the people that have the power, and we loan that to government. And if it is the other way around, if government grants rights, then government can also take those rights away. If that is the case, we would be similar to many of the other governments, many of the other civilizations, and we are not. We are the United States of America, founded upon four of these conservative principles.

All of these principles are conservative principles: the respect for tradition and wisdom of past generations, the rule of law, the belief in individual freedom and liberty, and the fourth thing is a belief in a law higher than man's law. That is God's law.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, those are the four principles of conservatism. A little tidbit of wisdom that came out this morning—and I made a little note and slipped it in my pocket—I think it is important that we here in this Congress reflect upon those values that made America great and what it is going to take to strengthen those values, restore those values, and carry America to the next level of our destiny.

When this Congress deviates from those principles, when this Congress deviates from the Constitution, when the Congress deviates from individual

rights, and when the Congress decides they can tax some people and transfer that wealth to other people and somehow be a leveler or some kind of a wealth transfer that resolves this class envy issue, then America is diminished because what it does is it diminishes the vitality of our people.

If you get out of bed and go to work every day and you know that Uncle Sam is going to get his share, the minute you punch that timeclock, Uncle Sam's hand comes out; and when he gets what he wants for the day, it goes in his pocket. Then the Governor's hand comes out, and he puts it in his pocket.

Then you have some other taxes to pay along the way, and when that is all done, some time in the afternoon, you get to actually work for yourself and your family.

Well, that is a little bit depressing to think you don't get to work even in the morning. If you go to work at 8 in the morning, you are taking your lunch break before you are getting anything for you and your family.

Now, what if the government is sitting there taking it all? What if it was we are going to confiscate all of the money you earn? Then we will deal it out to these other people, and you will get your government welfare check just like everybody else; and we will all have the same resources to work with.

We are all going to have the same amount of food, clothing and shelter, and recreation. We are all going to have the same health insurance policy. We are all going to drive an equal-value car, but some have to work, and those who don't want to don't.

Think about that. I have heard that. I have heard that debate on this floor. People will say—from over here on the leftist side of the aisle, they will say those that want a job should have a job, which implies that those who don't want to work shouldn't have to.

So if they are able-bodied and able-minded, then they should be contributing to this economy or have earned and stored up the wealth to sustain themselves, not tax the other person that is punching that timeclock or going to work for that salary because what happens is, pretty soon, the one who is being taxed to fund the one who is not working figures out that it doesn't pay so much to work.

It happens in the margins, so people start moving across from one side to the other; and over time, you will have good, smart, productive people who are smart enough to figure out that it doesn't pay for me to do this any longer, so they will drift over into maybe a part-time job, maybe work under the table, maybe some black market stuff, or they will tap into some of the 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs we have in this country and take their standard of living up above that they might have if all they did was work.

That is where this country has gone. The welfare program has grown so

great that it has discouraged some of our most productive people. It is a disincentive. It discourages me that, if we are maybe a generation removed, as I listened to the gentleman from the Hudson Valley, he is a generation removed from blue collar, I would like to think that we are always going to need blue-collar people.

We are always going to need for this country to have a middle class, a middle class that is growing in numbers and increasing in prosperity in relation to the productivity that they are putting out, and this country is always going to need to compete with the other countries in the world.

We can't just collapse down into the idea that we are going to be an economy that has professionals that live in gated communities that hire servants at a cheap rate, and then they will have the people that are a diminishing middle class and the unskilled and the low skilled that will make a meager wage, always keeping that meager wage down by a refueling of legal and illegal unskilled immigrants coming into this country that can only compete in the unskilled jobs.

The highest level of unemployment that we have—the double digit unemployment in this country are the people in the lowest skilled jobs. So how is it that almost every Democrat and a pretty respectable number of Republicans can leap to this conclusion, which is we need more unskilled workers, we need more of these workers to come in because it will grow the economy?

Well, just because you have somebody, if you bring in 1,000 people—and we know that we are going to have to educate the children especially and the youth, we will have to provide health care and housing and nutrition, the food, clothing, and shelter—as I said, 1,000 people could come in, and if one of them does a day's work, that contributes to the GDP, the gross domestic product.

So if the day's work of one in 1,000 contributes to the GDP, they, by their definition, say the economy is growing. The economy will grow if you have more and more immigration, and they don't say unskilled.

Well, we have an opening here for some skilled people to come into this country. We have an oversupply of unskilled. We have 101.4 million Americans of working age who are simply not in the workforce—101.4 million, that is from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The numbers total this: those 16 and up who are of working age, plus those who are on unemployment today—officially signed up on unemployment—add those two numbers together, 101.4 million.

A third of our population is of working age and not in the workforce. Yes, some are retired, and some are handicapped, and some are homemakers, and some of them are in school; but a whole lot of them could actually be recruited to come into the workforce and

produce that good or service with marketable value and increase our GDP.

What is the cost to our society for putting more of the people—the 101.4 million that are not in the workforce, what is the cost to our society? What if we called 10 million in? What if we called 20 million in? What if we brought 30 or 40 million of the 101.4 million in and put them in the workforce? What does that do?

Well, a significant percentage of them are on welfare and unemployment, so they are off the welfare and unemployment rolls. That reduces the burden for the taxpayers. When they go to the workforce, they are in the productive sector of the economy. They take their wage. They pay their own payroll tax. That means they are paying their Social Security and their Medicare and their Medicaid, so we get a twofor.

We reduce the welfare rolls. We get more and more taxpayers. We bring Social Security into balance just simply by virtue of more people going to work, and we have less of a deficit in our entitlements—Medicare and Medicaid—because they need less of it.

That is what happens if you get this country going at the right direction. There are a number of ways to do that. You can't do it with a President who doesn't believe in work, for one thing; and when they learned, according to the CBO score, that ObamaCare would cost this economy the equivalent of 2.5 million jobs, in other words, 40 hours a week times—and that is 40 hours, not the 30 hours that are in ObamaCare—40 hours a week times 2.5 million workers, that is the reduced amount of productivity that comes because of the disincentives to work that are associated with ObamaCare.

That is the equivalent of 2.5 million jobs. What does the administration say? They say: well, that is going to be a good thing because, if you are a homemaker, now you get to make more home. If you are an artist, you get to paint more paintings. If you have hobbies, you get to pursue your hobbies; and if you are a parent, you get to spend more time with your children.

This is the first time, I believe, in the history of this country, that a President of the United States and his administration have taken the position that less work was good for America, which just goes to show you that human beings have an almost indefinite capacity to self-rationalize, Mr. Speaker.

That is what happened with the Obama administration. They have exercised their almost infinite capacity to self-rationalize on piece after piece of this. They moved their socialist agenda, and then they self-rationalize along the way, and now, we are watching as ObamaCare has been a mess. It has been a debacle, and we are watching these numbers.

The administration says we got 7.1 million people to sign up. That was

their goal of 7 million. Miraculously, they overshot it by a little bit. What we don't know is how many of those 7.1 million were insured before ObamaCare; how many decided that they would opt out of their existing policy and into an exchange policy; how many of them lost their insurance because of ObamaCare and had no choice, if they wanted to remain insured, but to opt into an exchange under ObamaCare; and what percentage of the 7.1 million were actually uninsured without affordable options and found their way onto an ObamaCare exchange and purchased insurance.

Once you go through all that, how many of them were not subsidized out of the 7.1 million?

What would be the point, Mr. Speaker, and if we look at a society that supposedly had 48 million people without their own health insurance policy, I really wasn't alarmed by that because I don't know where the right comes from to own your own health insurance policy, but we provided health services to everybody in this country, at a minimum, to those who show up at an emergency room.

So somehow, they twisted this around to everybody has a right, everybody needs to own their own health insurance policy.

I stood on this floor 4 years ago or so and made the argument that, of the 48 million—when you subtract from that those who qualify for Medicaid and, from that, those who make over \$75,000 a year and presumably could buy their own health insurance, those who qualify, those who are unlawfully present in the United States, and you subtract from the 48 million, down to the number of those who are uninsured, your 48 million became 12.1 million, which is 4 percent of our population in the entire health care system of the United States, the insurance system and the delivery system, is entirely redirected, transformed under ObamaCare, to try to get at that 4 percent number.

Meanwhile, it looks to me that we will have more people uninsured, not less. By the way, if you want to sign up in the rest of this year, sorry, you are out of luck; you missed the signup deadline. Now, except for some narrow conditions, you will not be able to get insurance in this country. It is a calamity. It is one of the calamities.

Another one of the calamities, in the time that I have remaining, is a reflection upon the hearing today where Attorney General Holder came before the House Judiciary Committee.

His testimony comes about once a year before the Judiciary Committee. It is our job to have oversight over the Justice Department. We have done that for a long, long time.

As each of the members of the panel questioned Attorney General Holder under oath, here is how I reflect upon this: I asked Eric Holder if he still held the position he did when I last questioned him, in that the Department of Justice is an independent department

that doesn't take directive from the President, and his job is to provide equal justice under the law.

He agreed with that statement. I think it is a proper way to frame the job of Attorney General, but to argue that the Attorney General is not politically influenced by the President of the United States is a pretty tough argument to make when you think of this, Mr. Speaker.

I take you back to 2008. This was in the last weeks—or, actually, the last months of the Bush administration. Senator Ted Stevens, for 40 years, represented Alaska in the United States Senate. There were charges brought against him that were evaluated and investigated by Federal officers of the FBI.

On October 27, 2008, Senator Ted Stevens was found guilty of charges of corruption brought against him. Eight days later, he lost his election to now-Senator BEGICH in Alaska.

In October of the following year, former-Senator Stevens was killed in a tragic plane crash, but here is the modern news, Mr. Speaker: on March 27 of this year, it is announced, in a little news story that hardly got any play, that at least one of the FBI agents, Mary Beth Kepner, has been severely disciplined, and that discipline has been imposed for—let me say violations during the investigation and the prosecution of Senator Ted Stevens.

Now, he is dead. He can't speak for himself. He was convicted in a trial that took place and was concluded 8 days before his election. He narrowly lost the election in Alaska. This prosecution, if it was investigated and operated in the fashion that would be reflected when you see the language that Mary Beth Kepner, one of the FBI agents, was severely disciplined, and that discipline has been imposed, what is the discipline? What did they do?

Do we think Eric Holder is prosecuting, now, Mary Beth Kepner for her involvement in the prosecution of Ted Stevens, which may or may not have, but likely did bring about a change in the election of the United States Senate, so that it gave the Senate a 60-vote Democrat majority, and they were able to cram through components of ObamaCare that they would not have been able to cram through otherwise?

This, you would think, would be worthy of at least a comment on the part of Attorney General Eric Holder to look into and see: Is it worthy of, now, investigation and prosecution? Or could you at least release a statement as to the acts that she committed and the investigation that you did? If the case is closed, tell us.

When you have FBI agents improperly conducting themselves to the extent that the Holder Justice Department severely disciplined them, you have to wonder if it didn't change the course of history.

□ 2030

You have to wonder, if the FBI had not conducted themselves in that fashion that brought about the severe discipline, would Ted Stevens have been reelected? Would that have changed the results in the United States Senate? Would we, maybe, perhaps, not be living under ObamaCare today if those actions had not taken place inside this Justice Department? You would think the Attorney General would look into that or at least have a comment. That is number one.

The second one would be the very aggressive overreach of the investigation of Aaron Swartz, and that topic is something that brought about his suicide, and there has been much dialogue in this country about that.

Another one that I brought up to General Holder is this: the investigation and prosecution of Conrad Barrett. Now, we have all, Mr. Speaker, heard about the knockout game in this country. It is when youth, generally speaking, will go pick someone and decide, I am going to punch them and knock them out in the street, and see if I can do it with one punch, and my buddies are going to see me do this. Sometimes it is videotaped, and we see this on television. In the cases that I have seen and in the cases that have been reported, it is almost always black on white crime. The knockout game appears to be black on white crime.

I fought against, as well as did LOUIE GOHMERT of Texas, the hate crimes legislation because that just turns into a tool, and when you punish someone for what you think they think rather than for the overt act that they commit, you are getting into an area of law that allows for a lot of discretion on the part of the prosecution, and it may or may not result in more justice. I believe we ought to severely punish the people who are committing the overt acts, but we should not have gone down the road of the hate crimes legislation because that becomes a tool that can be used now to divide people against each other based upon whatever particular minority group we might be in.

You would think, with a country full of black on white crime and with a knockout game—something that has been all over the news for months now—that Eric Holder could find a way, if he wanted to prosecute a hate crime, to pick one of those African American youths who has gone in there and slugged and punched out someone on the streets who was targeted because of their difference in race. Instead, the Justice Department picked Conrad Barrett, a white guy who punched an African American, in order to play his side of the knockout game. If he is guilty of this, of course that is wrong, and he should be punished to the fullest extent of the law. We have States that can prosecute those kinds of assaults and violent acts, but it strikes me that the others didn't fit the profile of the Holder administration, so they went after the one exam-

ple of the white guy and the African American victim instead of all of the white victims and the African American alleged perpetrators. That stands out to me.

The next one is the prosecution of Dinesh D'Souza, who did the movie "Obama 2016." Yes, that hurt the administration. It brought some things out about where this administration is going, the Obama administration. He is no friend of the administration's, but it is alleged that he directed \$20,000 through friends to be given to a U.S. Senate campaign in New York. That is alleged. I don't know if it is true, but that is the allegation. Yet it must be true that there are thousands of Americans who have done a similar thing for a lot more money. The Holder Justice Department couldn't find them, but they found Dinesh D'Souza to target for prosecution.

They also targeted for Federal prosecution Governor Bob McDonnell, in Virginia, who has five former Virginia attorneys general who have vouched for the language of the law and who have said they believe the Holder Justice Department has stretched the limits of that. We shall see how that comes out.

Governor Chris Christie had a problem with the traffic being closed on a bridge, and it created a national furor, but within a week, the Holder Justice Department was investigating Governor Chris Christie for his use of the funds for the Sandy relief fund.

Now, how is it that the Holder Justice Department isn't going to look into the FBI's transgressions in the Senator Ted Stevens investigation, which brought about, I believe, a change in the result of that Senate election and a change in ObamaCare? How is it that they are not going to look into the overzealous prosecution of Carmen Ortiz and Aaron Swartz?

They are going to prosecute Conrad Barrett for a hate crime, and they are going to continue to prosecute Dinesh D'Souza, but it is just a coincidence that he produced "Obama 2016." They are going to continue to prosecute Republican Governor Bob McDonnell and Republican Governor Chris Christie while they let people off the hook, like the New Black Panthers in Philadelphia; James Clapper, who contradicted himself under oath, which would be, if proven, a perjury charge; Governor Jon Corzine, a Democrat from New Jersey, while there is \$1 billion missing in Global Crossing, and we can't find a way to investigate him; Lois Lerner, who is manipulating the IRS to persecute the President's political enemies, and the investigation has to take place by subpoena, in contempt of Congress, because the Holder Justice Department has turned a blind eye because the President has said there is not a smidgeon of corruption in the IRS; and exempting entire classes of people from prosecution, like illegal immigrants who haven't committed serious crimes. They are exempt from

prosecution and removal, and with marijuana, huge companies are exempted even though it is Federal law. With DOMA, Attorney General Holder has refused to defend DOMA before the Court.

Voter fraud instead, by the way, they prosecute. They bring action against States like Texas, which simply want voter ID, and they allege that Texas is imposing a poll tax and that it is a racist plot.

That is what we have, Mr. Speaker, in the Justice Department today. It is hard to call it justice. It is going to be hard to take this country to the next level of our destiny. These values that I have brought out in the beginning—these values of respect for tradition and wisdom of past generations, the rule of law, individual freedom and liberty, and a belief in a law higher than man's law—we must restore in this country if we are to restore the pillars of American exceptionalism.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2195. An act to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has been found to have been engaged in espionage activities or a terrorist activity against the United States and poses a threat to United States national security interests; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 404. An act to preserve the Green Mountain Lookout in the Glacier Peak Wilderness of the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 9, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5265. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Swap Data Repositories — Access to SDR Data by Market Participants (RIN: 3038-AE14) received March 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5266. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges

and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Change in Size and Grade Requirements for Grapefruit [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0015; FV14-906-2 IR] received March 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5267. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Potatoes From Mexico [Docket No.: APHIS-2013-0037] (RIN: 0579-AD78) received April 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5268. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0002; FV14-932-1 FR] received April 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5269. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization; Disclosure to Shareholders; Disclosure to Investors in System-wide and Consolidated Bank Debt Obligations of the Farm Credit System; Advisory Vote (RIN: 3052-AD00) received April 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5270. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael Ferriter, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5271. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report for 2013 on the STARBAS Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5272. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Clauses with Alternates-Research and Development Contracting (DFARS Case 2013-D026) (RIN: 0750-A110) received March 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5273. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Clauses with Alternates-Quality Assurance (DFARS Case 2013-D004) (RIN: 0750-AH95) received March 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5274. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Performance-Based Payments (DFARS Case 2011-D045) (RIN: 0750-AH54) received March 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5275. A letter from the Vice Chairman and Under Secretary for Intelligence, Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Department of Defense, transmitting certification that the EP-3E Airborne Reconnaissance Integrated Electronic System II and the Special Projects Aircraft platforms meet all current requirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5276. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule — Application of the Revised Capital Framework to the Capital Plan and Stress Test Rules [Regulations Y and YY;

Docket Nos.: R-1463 and R-1464; RIN: 7100 AE-01 and AE-02] received April 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5277. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Defense Production Act (DPA) Title III fund for Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5278. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conforming Amendment to the Section 184 Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program Regulations [Docket No.: FR-5772-F-01] (RIN: 2577-AC91) received March 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5279. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Alternative Fuel Transportation Program; Alternative Fueled Vehicle Credit Program Modification and Other Amendments [Docket ID No.: EERE-2011-OT-0066] (RIN: 1904-AB81) received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5280. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Refrigeration Equipment [Docket Number: EERE-2010-BT-STD-0003] (RIN: 1904-AC19) received April 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5281. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Vitamin D2 Bakers Yeast [Docket No.: FDA-2009-F-0750] received March 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5282. A letter from the Deputy Chief, CGB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Closed Captioning of Video Programming; Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc. Petition for Rulemaking [CG Docket No.: 05-231] (PRM11CG) received March 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5283. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Freedom of Information Act; Miscellaneous Rules received March 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5284. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule — Enforcement Guidance Memorandum 2014-001: Interim Guidance for Dispositioning 10 CFR Part 37 Violations with Respect to Large Components or Robust Structures Containing Category 1 or Category 2 Quantities of Material at Power Reactor Facilities Licensed Under 10 CFR Parts 50 and 52 (RIN: 3150-A112) received April 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5285. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification of export to China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5286. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f)

of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 14-13 informing of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding with Australia, Canada, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5287. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a memorandum of understanding with the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development of Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5288. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on U.S. support for Taiwan's participation as an observer at the 67th World Health Assembly and in the work of the World Health Organization, as mandated in the 2004 Participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization Act, Pub. L. 108-235, Sec. 1(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5289. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5290. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting Fiscal Year 2013 Annual Performance; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5291. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-305, "Marijuana Possession Decriminalization Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5292. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-306, "DC Promise Establishment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5293. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-304, "Belmont Park Designation and Establishment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5294. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5295. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's annual report for Fiscal Year 2013 prepared in accordance with Section 203(a) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5296. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5297. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the Authority's Fiscal Year 2013 annual report prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5298. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the

Board's FY 2013 Buy American Act report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5299. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Pay for Senior-Level and Scientific or Professional Positions (RIN: 3206-AL88) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5300. A letter from the President and CEO, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2013 Annual Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002 Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5301. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report for Calendar Year 2013, in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5302. A letter from the Deputy Commissioner for Human Resources, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2013 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5303. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XD137) received March 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5304. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XD157) received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5305. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Adjustment of Georges Bank and Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic Yellowtail Flounder Annual Catch Limits [Docket No.: 140113030-4109-01] (RIN: 0648-XD081) received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5306. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XD137) received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5307. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric

Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Individual Fishing Quota Program [Docket No.: 120416009-4095-02] (RIN: 0648-BB78) received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5308. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; 2014 and 2015 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XC927) received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5309. A letter from the Director, Administrative Offices of the United States Courts, transmitting the Office's report entitled, "Executive Summary of the 2013 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5310. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the PRO IP Act Annual Report FY 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5311. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting a recommendation to modify the cost of the Poplar Island, Maryland, project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5312. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting a recommendation for modifying the cost of the Illinois Shoreline Erosion, Interim III, Wilmette, Illinois, to the Illinois-Indiana State Line (Chicago Shoreline) project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5313. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting recommendations to increase the authorized total projected cost of the Western Sarpy and Clear Creek, Nebraska flood risk reduction project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5314. A letter from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Gross Combination Weight Rating: Definition [Docket No.: FMCSA-2012-0156] (RIN: 2126-AB72; Formerly RIN: 2126-AB53) received April 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5315. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Seaway Regulations and Rules: Periodic Update, Various Categories [Docket No.: SLSDC-2014-0001] (RIN: 2135-AA33) received April 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5316. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Adoption of Certain Special Permits and Competent Authorities into Regulations [Docket No.: PHMSA-2011-0158 (HM-233C)] (RIN: 2137-AE82) received April 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5317. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a proposed bill entitled the "Federal Aviation Insurance Reauthorization Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5318. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Office of Government Contracting

and Business Development, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for fiscal year 2012 on Minority Small Business and Capital Ownership Development; to the Committee on Small Business.

5319. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the taxation of Social Security and Railroad Retirement Benefits for Calendar Years 2005 through 2009, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401 nt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5320. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Electronic Submission of Forms, the Finished Products Records for Distilled Spirits Plants, and Closures on Certain Distilled Spirits Products [Docket No.: TTB-2014-0004; T.D. TTB-119] (RIN: 1513-AB97) received April 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5321. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Issuance of Opinion and Advisory Letters for Pre-approved Defined Contribution Plans for the Second Six-Year Cycle, Deadline for Employer Adoption and Opening of Determination Letter Program for Pre-approved Plan Adopters (Announcement 2014-16) received March 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5322. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 911(d)(4) Update (Rev. Proc. 2014-25) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5323. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Eligibility for Premium Tax Credit for Victims of Domestic Abuse [Notice 2014-23] received March 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5324. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Shared Responsibility for Employers Regarding Health Coverage [TD 9655] (RIN: 1545-BL33) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5325. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a joint report that describes activities related to the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) Budget Plan and Review for FY 2012-2017; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

5326. A letter from the Vice Chairman, World War One Centennial Commission, transmitting the Commission's activities to date and the initial strategic plan; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services, Natural Resources, and Oversight and Government Reform.

5327. A letter from the Chairman and Vice Chairman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, transmitting notification of a public hearing held on "China's Military Modernization and its Implications for the United States"; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 4419. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require periodic review

of listings of endangered species and threatened species under that Act, to support protection and conservation measures for endangered or threatened species under that Act and to alleviate the need to list a species as an endangered or threatened species, to convey small parcels of National Forest System land and Department of the Interior land to generate revenues for such protection and conservation measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 4420. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use designated funding to pay for construction of authorized rural water projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4421. A bill to extend the authorization for the Automobile National Heritage Area in Michigan; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4422. A bill to authorize the President to establish the Veterans' Job Corps as a means of providing gainful employment to unemployed veterans and widows of veterans through the performance of useful public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 4423. A bill to provide for no net increase in the total acreage of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 4424. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a database that shall serve as a central location for information from investigations relating to human trafficking for Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 4425. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to improve the Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HONDA, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CLAY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CHU, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 4426. A bill to promote the domestic development and deployment of clean energy technologies required for the 21st century; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4427. A bill to provide for a grants program to develop and enhance integrated nu-

trition curricula in medical schools; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 4428. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the energy credit for microturbine property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. KIND, Mr. NUNES, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. REED, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 4429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the subpart F exemption for active financing income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. GARDNER):

H.R. 4430. A bill to amend the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act to ensure that certain facilities continue to be treated as alcohol-related facilities, notwithstanding the distribution of spent grains resulting from the production of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 546. A resolution electing certain Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. LANKFORD):

H. Res. 547. A resolution affirming the vital role that prayer has played throughout the more than 200-year history of our nation, strengthening the fabric of our society, and recognizing May 1, 2014, as the 63rd annual National Day of Prayer; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H. Res. 548. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the mandatory annual ethics training offered to Members, officers, and employees of the House to include a specific program of training in the prevention and deterrence of sexual harassment in employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Res. 549. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the need to explore emerging technologies that are mobile and capable of supplying high volumes of sterile, pathogenic-free water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 4419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Arti-

cle I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 4420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 4423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 4424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 4425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 4426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 4427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To provide for a grants program to develop and enhance integrated nutrition curriculum in medical schools.

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 4428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 4429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 7 which provides that "All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 4430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 164: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 184: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 318: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 352: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HALL, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 482: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 508: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 515: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 597: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 647: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 683: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 713: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 792: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 831: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 863: Mr. HOYER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 921: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 946: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 963: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1008: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1020: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1141: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1148: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1250: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1252: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 1318: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1354: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 1428: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 1461: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 1462: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 1579: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1648: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1812: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1852: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2131: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2146: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2202: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2203: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. POSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. SIREs, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2221: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2240: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2288: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2291: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2364: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2366: Mr. KLINE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BASS, Ms. TITUS, Ms. ESTY, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. HAHN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. CHU, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2377: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2548: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2782: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2805: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2827: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2870: Mr. HONDA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. TERRY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2901: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2939: Mr. HORSFORD and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2996: Mr. TURNER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3012: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 3040: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3086: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3179: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 3199: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 3211: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 3344: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3377: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 3382: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 3383: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3408: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 3461: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 3465: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 3489: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 3530: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 3546: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 3576: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 3610: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3658: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3698: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3708: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 3710: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 3717: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 3833: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 3836: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 3930: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 3963: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 4031: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 4035: Mr. HOLT and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 4058: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 4065: Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 4080: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4103: Mr. CLAY, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 4119: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 4120: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 4148: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 4156: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. BARLETTA, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 4166: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ESTY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 4188: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 4213: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 4225: Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 4227: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 4232: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 4286: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 4299: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 4300: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 4303: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 4305: Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 4315: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 4318: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 4319: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 4320: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 4342: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 4357: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 4370: Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 4382: Mr. COLE and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 4387: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 4403: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 4414: Mr. HIMES, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 4418: Mr. PETRI, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. DUFFY.

H.J. Res. 34: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H. Res. 417: Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 422: Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 456: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H. Res. 494: Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 509: Mr. ROYCE and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Res. 525: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H. Res. 540: Mr. DUFFY, Ms. BASS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HANNA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 542: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.